DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 060 EC 302 685

AUTHOR Sailor, Wayne; And Others
TITLE Restructuring Education in the 90s.
INSTITUTION San Francisco State Univ., CA. California Research Inst.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 92
CONTRACT G0087C3056
NOTE 53p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Educational Change; Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Health Services; *Mainstreaming; Models; Participative Decision Making; Preschool Education; Program Development; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; School Role; Social Services; Special Education

ABSTRACT

This report describes the Comprehensive Local School approach to school restructuring, which envisions the school as the coordinating vehicle for all children's services, including health and social services, and which reconfigures and coordinates all categorical programs at the school site under a site-based management system characterized by a participatory decision-making process. The report presents a reprint of an article from the journal, "Remedial and Special Education" by Wayne Sailor, titled "Special Education in the Restructured School." The article identifies trends in special education reform, including the movement to integrate students with severe disabilities into general educational schools and classrooms and the effort to retain students with mild and moderate disabilities in the general classroom. The article then proposes that reform efforts in general education present an opportunity for amalgamation of related viewpoints through broad-based, school restructuring policy reform. This amalgamation is reflected in regulatory waivers, site-based management and budgetary control, shared decision making, and full infusion of federal categorical program resources into the general education program. A list of 12 organizations that support innovative restructuring efforts by schools is presented, and a list of the schools that these organizations support or work with in restructuring and reforming educational programs is also provided. In addition, a list is presented of 21 schools that indicated in a survey that they were implementing general and special education reform. (JDD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

CALIFORNIA RESEARCH INSTITUTE
ON THE INTEGRATION OF STUDENTS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES

ED 365 060

# RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION IN THE 90S

By:

*Wayne Sailor*
*Dotty Kelly*
*Patricia Karasoff*

California Research Institute
San Francisco State University

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EC 302685

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY 14 TAPIA DRIVE SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94132 415-338-7847 415-338-7848

# RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION IN THE 90S

By:

*Wayne Sailor*
*Dotty Kelly*
*Patricia Karasoff*

California Research Institute
San Francisco State University

December, 1992

Supported by the California Research Institute (Grant # G0087C3056), a cooperative agreement funded by the Office of Special Education Programs. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position and policy of the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

# Restructuring Education In the 90s

The California Research Institute (CRI), federally funded at San Francisco State University since 1982, has a total of ten years of research experience with states and school districts throughout the United States involved in innovative, systematic reform efforts to enhance the education for students with disabilities.

Based on this research and experience, in 1985 CRI began the development of an approach to school restructuring which was widely disseminated in 1989 with the publication of the text, Comprehensive Local School: Regular Education for All Students with Disabilities (Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler, & Goetz, 1989). This model, which began with efforts to integrate students with severe disabilities into the life of the regular school, has expanded over the past three years to a model of school restructuring that is strongly geared to coordinated management of categorical resources to the collective advantage of all students at the school site; hence, the term "comprehensive" local school.

The integration institute at CRI, which has now concluded its five years of federal funding, conducted a large-scale research program in support of various components of the restructuring model. The published research base up to 1988 was reviewed in Halvorsen and Sailor (1990) and in Sailor et al. (1989).

The CLS model in its present form is a blend of the categorical program-driven model published in Sailor et al. (1989) and the California Department of Education Reform Initiative (California Department of Education, 1990; Winget, 1990). The model is generic in the sense that it can be adapted wholly, or in part, to fit restructuring goals and objectives of any school, public or private. It is specifically designed to operate on existing school district resources, so that new sources of revenue are not required for either initial start-up or long-range implementation. The CLS model has five distinct components, each of which is geared to a specific age group in the educational

continuum. School organization and restructuring is thus examined in terms of issues affecting (1) early childhood programs; (2) elementary programs; (3) middle school, or junior high school programs; (4) secondary programs; and (5) post compulsory educational programs.

Comprehensive Local School as an approach to school restructuring has two principal features that distinguish it from many other models: (1) CLS envisions the school as the coordinating vehicle for all children's services, going beyond traditional educational issues to encompass health and social service issues as well. Schools under this model gradually progress toward comprehensive, interdisciplinary children's service centers, with education comprising the primary service around which other services are configured according to need; and (2) CLS functions as a comprehensive, unified educational vehicle with all categorical programs reconfigured and coordinated at the school site under a strong site-based management system characterized by a participatory decision-making process.

Other key variables related to the CLS restructured school at each level of schooling are described in detail in Sailor's 1991 article, Special Education in the Restructured School, located in Section One of this document.

In response to a request by states involved in systems change to support the integration of students with severe disabilities, CRI has developed the following list of restructuring organizations located across the country. These organizations support innovative restructuring efforts by schools.

Our objective in sharing this information is to encourage collaboration and the building of bridges between restructuring/reform initiatives in special education and general education systems. We wish to support the efforts of educators to join forces with one another to ensure that all students can succeed in schools that will embrace the diversity they bring in ethnic origin, color, socio-economic level, language, or ability.

The organizations listed in Section Two have provided CRI with a list of schools they support or work with in restructuring and reforming educational programs. The list provided in Section Three is a compilation of all the school lists provided to us by the organizations. This list is organized by state, not by organizational affiliation.

In addition, a list of twenty-one schools can be found in Section Four which includes those schools that responded to a CRI survey focused on collaboration between general and special education. These schools indicated that they were implementing reform that included both general and special education.

Since this task has been underway since early 1992, it is possible that some of the names and phone numbers have changed. We regret any inaccuracy in this information.

***It is important to note that CRI has not had the opportunity to visit these school sites and/or validate their restructuring efforts. We present this list based on the sites' indicating that they wished to be included on our list.***

References

Halvorsen, A., & Sailor, W. (1990). Integration of students with severe and profound disabilities: A review of research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Issues and research in special education (vol. 1) (pp. 110-172). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Halvorsen, A., Doering, K., Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Winget, P. (Ed.) (1990). Education programs must integrate to benefit all students at every school, says Honig. The Special EDge, 4(7), pp. 1, 3-4.

# SECTION ONE

## "Special Education in the Restructured School"

(Sailor, 1991)

RASE

Special Issue Article

# Special Education in the Restructured School

Wayne Sailor

*Two significant, overriding trends in reform have emerged in special education at all levels from policy to program implementation during the past decade. These are, first, the movement to integrate students with severe disabilities and those with low-incidence disabilities into general education schools and classrooms for their educational programs; second, the effort to retain students with mild and moderate disabilities in the general classroom as an alternative to pull-out programs. These trends are closely associated. Until recently, parallel trends in general education reform have tended to focus on improvement in curriculum and in instructional techniques. Most recently, however, these reform efforts have shifted in the direction of systematic reorganization of school governance structures, policy, and resource utilization at the school site. This shift presents an opportunity for amalgamation of these various related viewpoints through broad-based, school restructuring policy reform. This amalgamation is particularly reflected in those aspects of restructuring that are concerned with regulatory waivers, site-based management and budgetary control, shared decision making, and full infusion, with school site coordination, of federal, categorical program resources into the general education program. Sufficient parallels exist between the general and special education reform agendas to suggest that the time may be at hand for a shared educational agenda.*

SIGNIFICANT REFORM EFFORTS have characterized special education over the past decade. Parallel efforts at reform have also been under way over the same period in general education. Until recently, these separate reform directions have held relatively little significance for one another and, if anything, have tended to increase the separation between the two groups of educators. Very recently, however, the dominant trend of reform in general education has shifted attention to organization and governance issues in an effort to better support the needs of a changing demography, characterized by greater diversity among the nation's collective student body.

Within special education, dominant reform trends have been focused in part on achieving greater social and, to a degree, academic integration of students with wide-ranging types of significant disabilities in general education schools and classrooms. For example, emphasis is frequently placed on partial participation in the general classroom curriculum, assisted by curricular and technological adaptations (e.g., Thousand & Villa, 1989), for students with even the most severe disabilities. A larger and more controversial agenda has been focused on efforts to retain students with milder disabilities, such as learning disabilities, in general education classrooms and to reduce the incidence of utilization of pull-out strategies, such as self-contained classes and resource room configurations for these students.

In general education, reform efforts have shifted recently, from intensive concentration on efforts to improve curriculum and instruction, to efforts in the reorganization of school and district-level governance systems and in the manner in which fiscal and personnel resources are allocated and utilized at the school site. This shift in emphasis in general education reform presents a window of opportunity for the emergence of a shared educational agenda, one that holds poten-

tial for capturing the innovative elements of improvement and reform in federal categorical programs such as special education as well as elements in general education reform. In the remainder of this paper, the basis for a shared educational agenda in school reform is examined by considering dominant aspects of special education reform in light of the current school restructuring movement.

## Trends in Special Education Reform

The movement of students with significant and multiple disabilities ("severely handicapped") into general educational settings has undeniably represented the hallmark of research and development activity concerned with this population over the past decade. Much of the summative literature base of the 1970s was concerned with how and what to teach, focusing on behavioral teaching technology with its emphasis on task analysis and data management schemes (Haring & Bricker, 1978; Haring & Brown, 1976, 1977; Sontag, 1977; York & Edgar, 1979). In the 1980s the focus shifted palpably to a concern with where to teach and the ramifications of the learning environment. This past decade also witnessed the least restrictive environment (LRE) language in statutory and regulatory language begin to take on a major significance from policy-level decisions to classroom practice (Sailor, Wilcox, & Brown, 1980; Snell, 1978).

The emphasis on social and, to a lesser degree, academic integration of the population with more severe disabilities has been strongly buttressed by positive outcomes in comparative "efficacy" studies (Brinker & Thorpe, 1984; Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990; Meyer, Peck, & Brown, 1990; Sailor et al., 1989), and by legal-policy analytic interpretations of the litigative history of P.L. 94-142 (Gilhool, 1989; Gilhool & Stutman, 1978). The integration thrust has met only token resistance in the research literature (Burton & Hirschoren, 1979; Cruickshank, 1977; Gottlieb, 1981; Haywood, 1981), but no controlled studies have surfaced to date presenting data supportive of separate rather than integrated educational programs (see Halvorsen & Sailor, 1990, for a review of efficacy studies on integration).

### Students with Severe Disabilities

Studies of specific issues in the placement of students with severe disabilities are few in number and inconclusive, but seem to suggest increased placements in more integrated educational environments over time (Haring et al., in press) characterized by a great deal of variability across the states (Danielson & Bellamy, 1989). The emphasis on integrated educational placements appears to extend to students with the most severe disabilities, including those with significant health or behavioral problems (Campbell & Bailey, in press; Sailor, Gee, Graham, & Goetz, 1988), and to encompass a "zero-rejection" philosophy, wherein no student or disability category would be deemed too disabled to be integrated (Sailor, Gerry, & Wilson, in press-b).

> "In general education, reform efforts have shifted recently, from intensive concentration on efforts to improve curriculum and instruction, to efforts in the reorganization of school and district-level governance systems and in the manner in which fiscal and personnel resources are allocated and utilized at the school site."

Most recently, the emphasis in the literature pertaining to integration of students with severe disabilities has shifted from a discussion of approaches that exemplify special class models within regular schools, where integration occurs primarily in extraneous school settings such as assemblies, recess, and lunch time involving peer tutors, friendship relationships, etc., to a discussion of "full inclusion" models that exemplify placement of these children in the general classroom with some program time in other environments, as needed (Biklen, Bogdan, Ferguson, Searl, & Taylor, 1985; Falvey, 1989; Forest & Lusthaus, 1989; Sailor et al., 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1990; Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989; Thousand & Villa, 1989). The pros and cons of these relative placement considerations are discussed in Brown et al. (1989a, 1989b) and in Sailor et al. (in press-b).

The full inclusion approach to the provision of integrated special educational services to low-incidence and severe disability populations appears to be gaining strength across the country. A recent study by the California Research Institute (CRI) resulted in the identification of some 15 school districts around the country that are reported by their administrative staff as entirely, or close to being entirely, operated on a full inclusion basis (Karasoff & Kelly, 1989), with the most extensively documented service delivery model to emerge to date being provided by the Johnson City School District in upstate New York (Mamary & Rowe, 1990). Three entire states have now published their intent to commit to some form of a full inclusion delivery system within a short time span: Colorado (McNulty, 1990); Iowa (Hamre-Nietupski, Nietupski, & Maurer, 1990); and Vermont (Williams et al., 1986). Other states, including California, with the impetus provided by their successful competition in the federal Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) systems change grants program to enhance

less restrictive educational placements (e.g., Winget, 1990), are developing positions of policy and program implementation philosophy that suggest strong trends toward statewide full inclusion practices. Several Canadian models have also emerged, most notably in Ontario and New Brunswick (Forest, 1987; Stainback et al., 1989; Vandercook, York, & Forest, 1989). Finally, within western European countries, Italy stands out as the country with the most visible application of full inclusion educational services, particularly in the northern provinces of Liguria (i.e., Genoa) and Emilia-Romagna (i.e., Bologna) (Gaylord-Ross, 1987; Sailor, 1989; Vitello, 1989).

The basic components that most full inclusion models share include:

1. All students attend the school to which they would go if they had no disability.
2. A natural proportion (i.e., representative of the school district at large) of students with disabilities occurs at any school site.
3. A zero-rejection philosophy exists so that typically no student would be excluded on the basis of type or extent of disability [except, see Sailor, Gerry, & Wilson (in press-a) for a discussion of the implications of these models for children with deafness].
4. School and general education placements are age- and grade-appropriate, with no self-contained special education classes operative at the school site.
5. Cooperative learning and peer instructional methods receive significant use in general instructional practice at the school site.
6. Special education supports are provided within the context of the general education class and in other integrated environments.

Obviously, a school organization that includes these six points can only exist in the context of a unified educational program wherein planning for the education of general as well as special populations at the school site is a shared responsibility of the total professional and administrative staff (Stainback et al., 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1990), and, conversely, where special education does not function as a "second system" (Gartner & Lipsky, 1990b) with descriptors such as "a school within a school," "side-by-side program," and so on.

## Students with Mild or Moderate Disabilities

Although the integration imperative has met with relatively little resistance from the educational research community, efforts to reform service delivery to the population of students with milder disabilities, to the contrary, have generated enormous controversy. These efforts surfaced visibly in 1986 as a federal policy initiative (Will, 1986), called the Regular Education Initiative, or REI, which seemed to suggest that responsibility for the education of these children should best be viewed as a shared responsibility of all educators rather than the sole purview of special education. The initiative quickly gained support from several prominent educational researchers whose data collectively suggested that under certain service delivery models, children with learning disabilities, for example, would do better in mainstreamed educational programs than in pull-out, resource-room, separate classroom-oriented programs (Wang & Peverly, 1987; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986, 1988). These publications resulted in an unprecedented entire issue of the *Journal of Learning Disabilities* (January 1988) being devoted to a rebuttal of the Wang and Reynolds research and program development efforts.

Later on, others argued that the REI was "deeply flawed" social policy in that it was a special education initiative rather than a regular education initiative (Singer, 1988; Singer & Butler, 1987), that REI was inappropriate for certain categorical disability groups (Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988), and that the REI constituted nothing less than a Republican plot to destroy special education and redirect the funds from P.L. 94-142 to a more socially affluent and high-achieving class of children and youth (Kauffman, 1989). [See also Goetz & Sailor (1990), Kauffman & Hallahan (1990), and McLeskey, Skiba, & Wilcox (1990), for discussions of this article.]

The issue on the special education side is clearly one that evokes strong emotion, even among otherwise sanguine academic researchers. Kauffman (1989), Singer (1988), Vergason and Anderegg (in press), and others have written in highly charged rhetorical terms on the topic, with reference to "throwing the baby out with the bathwater," for example. Opponents of REI have argued that its proponents believe:

1. No truly special instruction is needed by any student.
2. Special training is not required for handicapped students or for their teachers.
3. Specific targeting of funds for specific students is unnecessary.
4. All students can be instructed and managed effectively in general classrooms.
5. The more important equity issue is the site, not the quality of instruction. (Goetz & Sailor, 1990, p. 336)

McClesky et al. (1990) argued that extensive reviews of the literature that examine categorical labeling and grouping in terms of special education effectiveness collectively have revealed a set of conclusions that are at variance with the conclusions of the most vociferous reform opponents, particularly Kauffman (1989).

Goetz and Sailor (1990) argued that the "most radical" suggestions that can be gleaned from the sum total

of the reform literature are: (a) Special education may work best in mainstream educational settings; (b) categorical labels and homogeneous special education grouping strategies are nonprescriptive in themselves; and (c) special education may function most effectively as a support to the regular educational program rather than as a second system operating in parallel to regular education, but without sufficient contact and coordination with it. Opponents of special education reform who are focused on students with mild and moderate disabilities tend to view these efforts as an attack on and direct threat to special education, rather than as an attempt to introduce reform into special education that would align its mission more closely with that of the greater body of general education.

## Special Education Reform as a Cohesive Trend

In one sense REI is to children with moderate and mild disabilities as the integration imperative (Gilhool, 1989) is to children with low-incidence and severe disabilities. The common denominator is the principle of the least restrictive educational environment, which in turn is born of the recognition that social and communicative development in children with disabilities is predicated on opportunities for mainstream socialization as well as academic experiences, and that these experiences are an inherent entitlement of children with disabilities under the constitutional guarantee of freedom of association (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1989; Fine, 1983, 1987; Sailor, Gerry, & Wilson, in press-a). Current reform efforts in special education at both the policy and programmatic levels are aimed, as they are in the case of general educators, at redesigning existing statutory and regulatory systems to meet the needs of a changing demography of constituents and to better reflect major technological, curricular, and pedagogical advances over the recent short term (Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989).

Lowenbraun, Madge, and Affleck (1990), for example, presented some data that illuminate the perspective of parents of both special and general education students under reformed service models. Their results indicate that both sets of the parents they studied were satisfied with general class placement of special education students and that their degree of satisfaction increased over time. The parents of the special education children were particularly positive concerning friendships and self-esteem factors associated with the general class placement sample. A substantial 87% of the mainstream sample parents indicated that they would choose general class placement again.

Bauwens et al. (1989) reviewed a number of teacher consultation models that are facilitative of the goals of special education reform. They described a particular approach, which they call cooperative teaching, based on the collaborative consultation model of Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb, and Nevin (1986). These models stress the use of teams made up of special and general education classroom teachers at the school site (a) to determine curricular and pedagogical approaches to be used with mainstreamed students identified for special education support and (b) to facilitate joint planning for utilization of professional resources at the school to best serve all of the students at the school.

Downing and Eichinger (1990) and Slavin, Stevens, and Madden (1988) presented impressive arguments for the extension of cooperative learning strategies to promote mainstream educational programs for students with dual sensory impairments and with "academically handicapped" students, respectively. It is clear from the emergent survey research literature on mainstreaming, however, that although general education principals and other administrators may be quite open to implementation of these kinds of reforms, little of the process will likely occur without efforts to deal specifically with the fear of loss of responsibility for special education students by special education teachers, and fear of lack of adequate classroom support felt by general education classroom teachers (Garvar-Pinhas & Pedhazur Schmelkin, 1989; Knapp & Turnbull, 1990; Vladero, 1990). Gersten and Woodward (1990) and Miller (1990) presented balanced arguments on the reform controversy and suggested that it should best be viewed as that portion of the school restructuring reform movement that is concerned with special education. Semmel and Gerber (1990), in reviewing the collection of papers by general educators that made up the special issue of *Remedial and Special Education* concerned with the REI (May/June 1990), provided a thoughtful focus on the perspective of classroom teachers in the reform process. In the context of expressing the usual caveat of special educators against the potential for cannibalizing P.L. 94-142 to find the money to solve the myriad larger problems of general education (Kauffman, 1989; Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1989), the authors in this publication have *supported* the reform efforts. This support, however, contains the caveat that at least some teacher collaboration models, which successfully focus efforts on all students in the general education classroom (including special education students), will need to be disseminated as highly visible demonstrations.

Semmel and Gerber (1990) also cited in detail Dolores Durkin's (1990) report of a classroom teacher who failed to benefit from consultation on special education children in her classroom because the general education teacher held "slavishly" to the idea that all of the children in her class should complete a given curriculum at the same minimal level of performance (i.e., mastery). Semmel and Gerber concluded that these kinds of educational reforms can be positive to the extent that

1. Reform focuses on conditions that inhibit successful accommodations of *particular* children in general education classrooms.
2. An ethic of unified, school-based ownership of all children at the school, including ownership of the problems posed by all "difficult-to-teach" children, prevails at the school site.
3. Special education must be focused at the school, not the district level, and a mechanism must exist for shared decision making and joint responsibility for all students at the site (Glatthorn, 1990a, 1990b).

The current wave of school reform in general education is clearly focused less on accelerating students who are already high achievers, and much more on improving the performance of more challenging populations associated with the changing demography of U.S. schools. This circumstance creates a significant window of opportunity for aligning the reform efforts in special education discussed above to those of general education. In the next section, reform efforts in general education are examined with an eye to potential correspondence with parallel efforts in special education reform.

## Reform in General Education

### The Problem of Students at Risk

The changing demography of America's school population, coupled with the increasing demands of technological advances in business and industry, have given rise to startling findings in recent analyses of the preparedness of America's schools to adapt to these changes. Among the findings of concern:

- 1 million students drop out of school each year
- 1.5 million teenage women become pregnant each year
- Between ⅛ and ¼ of all U.S. children live below the poverty line
- On any given night it is estimated there are at least 100,000 homeless children
- Every year, more than 5,000 young people take their own lives
- More than 2.2 million cases of child abuse and neglect were reported in 1987
- Fifteen percent of graduates of urban high schools read at less than the 6th grade level
- Almost 10 million children have no regular source of medical care
- About 20 million children under age 17 have never seen a dentist
- An estimated 3 million children have a serious drinking problem. (Davis & McCaul, 1990, p. 4)

If "students at risk" are defined as comprising only those who are likely to leave school prematurely or to graduate without the social, academic, and vocational skills needed to lead a productive life in our society, current estimates would place the figure at about 30% of current enrollment and growing yearly (New Partnerships, 1988). Research on the factors placing students at risk have focused in recent years on the concept of educational disadvantage (Hodginson, 1985; Levin, 1985; McDill, Natriello, & Pallas, 1986) and its implications for the way services are organized at the school site.

The primary indicators of societal factors that place children at risk have been identified as (a) poverty; (b) minority, racial/ethnic group identity; (c) non-English or limited English background; and (d) specific family configurations, such as single parent households (Davis & McCaul, 1990). These societal factors, which have been extensively documented in, for example, Rose (1989) and Schoor (1988), interact with school organization and environmental factors such as defective student-teacher and parent-teacher communication, low-motivational instructional materials, weak or ineffectual school leadership, and outdated instructional procedures to produce an unbroken cycle of deterioration in American education (MDC, Inc., 1988).

Whether one uses a general definition of at risk such as "unlikely to graduate" (Slavin, 1989) or a more detailed analysis, such as "educationally disadvantaged children" (Levin, 1989), it is clear that the problem is not simply concentrated in and closely associated with areas of inner-city urban decay. A National School Boards Association (1989) study indicated that as many as three-fifths of the at-risk population can be found in rural and suburban areas.

According to Lipsky and Gartner (1989), the present wave of reform in general education is characterized by a focus on higher standards of performance and professionalism at the state and local levels, and on effective schools research-based methods, such as cooperative learning and mechanisms for peer tutorial services (Bickel & Bickel, 1986; Gartner & Lipsky, 1990a; Jenkins & Jenkins, 1981), to address primarily the problems presented by the population of students at risk. The hallmark of this reform is community empowerment in the life of the schools (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988; Committee for Economic Development, 1987). Current school restructuring efforts, for example, are concerned with greater parent involvement in the decision-making apparatus of the schools, and greater community participation in school management, such as is evidenced by the local school governing board experiment currently under way in Chicago. Finally, greater flexibility in the integration of resources available to the school site through federal categorical programs is being strongly advanced (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Lipsky & Gartner, 1989).

One of the principal recommendations of the report by the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE), *To Secure Our Future: The Federal Role in Education* (1989), is to restructure schools for high performance. The report stresses incorporation of curriculum and instruction to promote mastery of higher order thinking skills in all students; requiring performance-oriented outcomes for school achievement; upgrading teacher skills and standards; and giving teachers more authority in school decision making. Most important, the NCEE report calls for a comprehensive restructuring of the way categorical programs, such as Special Education, Chapter I, Vocational Education, Adult Education, Bilingual Education, Head Start, and other programs, are operated. Removal of children from opportunities to succeed or even excel in the mainstream, according to the report, is costly and detrimental to all, particularly since the relatively rich resources provided through categorical programs to benefit children who are often inappropriately labeled neither demonstrably improves their educational outcomes in isolation (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989), nor allows for the maximization of educational resources for the good of all.

The categorical restructuring of the type recommended by NCEE can be accomplished within the framework of existing rules, regulations, and waiver processes to permit experiments in school restructuring to be properly evaluated and useful models to be disseminated without throwing various categorical "babies" out with the proverbial bathwater (Vergason & Anderegg, in press). The rules and regulations governing the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), for example, are specifically designed to protect the rights of children with disabilities and prevent their resources from being redirected to meet the needs of "more capable, but underachieving" populations. Compromising those protections is dangerous, unwise, and unwarranted, particularly if it can be demonstrated that IDEA resources can be harnessed and coordinated in such a manner, at the school site, to actually improve outcomes for students with disabilities while, at the same time, having a positive impact on the total school population through an integrated programmatic structure (California State Department of Education, 1989).

In addition to innovation in assessment, curriculum, and instructional practices, most school restructuring models that have been described in the literature to date have at least three of the following four primary sets of operations in common:

1. School organizational autonomy
2. Site-based management and shared decision making
3. Full infusion and coordination of categorical resources
4. Community participation in the life of the school

## School Organizational Autonomy

Elmore and Associates (1990) have argued that school restructuring must concern itself with curriculum and teaching technology issues, but only within the context of school organization, school governance, and the place of the governance structures within the state systems. Cohen (1988) similarly argues that restructuring must be viewed as organizationally multitiered and, most important, must be related in clear, measurable ways to improved school productivity and student performance. States must stimulate restructuring through evolving functional standards of accountability, highly publicized results of accountability data, and by providing rewards and sanctions linked to school/student performance. Concomitant changes at the school, district, and state levels will be required to accomplish restructuring.

David, together with her colleagues (David, 1990; David, Cohen, Honetschlage, & Traiman, 1990), recently provided a set of recommendations to the nation's governors entitled *State Actions to Restructure Schools: First Steps*, a publication of the Center for Policy Research of the National Governors' Association (David et al., 1990). David et al. approach restructuring from a policy analysis perspective, and target specific actions that can be initiated at the level of the state education agency to stimulate action at the district level. Their blueprint for state action includes the following steps:

1. Define restructuring at the state level and create a vision for its outcomes.
2. Initiate conferences, statewide and regional, to inform the educational community and the public about the initiative.
3. Build statewide support for the initiative through networking organizations.
4. Start small with invited or competed pilot demonstration projects.
5. Offer access to waivers from state rules to facilitate demonstration projects (see Table 1 for examples of waiver requests).
6. Provide time for staff development and staff meetings to get restructuring off the ground.
7. Offer technical assistance and training from state and brokered services.
8. Gradually shift the state role from compliance policeman to facilitator and assistance provider.
9. Provide an outcomes-driven philosophy that stresses school accountability and increases student performance.
10. Maintain a clear focus on the specific goals and objectives of a state-level restructuring initiative.

What is clear from the writings of David, and also Skrtic (1988; 1990), is that restructuring is a viable concept and worth retaining as a clearly focused set of

Table 1. Examples of Waiver Requests

- Use textbook money for books and materials not on the approved list
- Combine three high school classes into a three-hour block of time
- Allow teachers professional leave time during the school year
- Allow an elementary certified teacher to teach with a ninth-grade team
- Allow secondary teachers to teach subjects other than their certified subject in order to participate on a multidisciplinary team
- Shorten the high school day to allow time for forty-minute special topic seminars for small mixed grade groups taught by teachers, administrators, and clerical staff
- In order to provide additional time for teachers to meet and plan:
  - Reduce student contact hours;
  - Hire a full-time substitute; and
  - Set aside full days without students for teachers
- Ignore state curriculum guidelines in order to implement a cross-disciplinary curriculum
- Ignore class size limits to allow large classes for certain presentations freeing teachers to have small discussion groups
- Remove grade-level restrictions on the use of paraprofessionals to enable schools to use them as needed
- Ignore requirements for specified minutes of instruction by subject area to allow more flexibility in how time is spent
- Redefine high school credits to permit credits for cross-disciplinary courses

*Note.* From *State Actions to Restructure Schools: First Steps* (p. 21) by J. David, M. Cohen, D. Honetschlager, and S. Traiman, 1990, Washington, DC: National Governor's Association, Center for Policy Research. Reprinted by permission.

goals, objectives, and specifiable outcomes; restructuring cannot be accomplished from either the "top down" by a policy analytic/administrative set of interventions, nor can it effectively proceed from the "ground up" by simply restructuring what goes on within individual schools in isolation. Effective restructuring is organizationally systemic in nature and must proceed from both directions simultaneously. The set of operations required for school organizational autonomy require multilevel policy analyses and clear specifications as to the extent of autonomy and flexibility afforded to the school site.

## Site-Based Management and Shared Decision Making

Virtually all of the broad strategies that have emerged in the recent literature of school restructuring have stressed the component of decentralized governance (Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). In these systems, the locus of decision making with regard to the day-to-day operation of school programs is largely shifted from the central district office to the school site administrators, with the result being much more flexibility and autonomy among the schools, both in organization/governance and in program implementation.

Site-based management models allow decisions to be made about how various categorical revenues are to be coordinated and utilized, how instruction is to be organized and delivered, how curriculum and materials are to be selected and staffing arrangements to be made—all concentrated at the level of the building principal (Cohen, 1988). Site-based management can, of course, vary substantially on dimensions of school organization, such as the extent to which the management style is "bureaucratic or adhocratic" (Skrtic, 1988).

Shared decision making is one current focus of site-based management efforts at restructuring. Under this model, teachers, other school staff, administrators, and parents form a group that is charged with the responsibility of making key school decisions in allocating resources. Issues such as how students and staff are assigned to classrooms; how roles of administrators are to be determined; how personnel are evaluated, hired, fired, or promoted; curriculum issues; all can come under the purview of a shared-responsibility, site-management group.

The issue of teacher authority in decision-making models at the school site is a second factor in site-based management models that may directly affect teacher motivation and job performance (e.g., Cistone, Fernandez, & Tornillo, 1989). It is axiomatic that "fired-up" teachers produce results that are reflected in a wide range of pupil-focused outcomes. Teacher motivation has long been a critical, neglected, and puzzling variable in the school reform literature, but is clearly linked to teacher perception of professional authority in all aspects of the life of the school (The Holmes Group, 1986; McDonnell & Pascal, 1988). The most creative ideas for educational reform at the school site level will have only a fraction of their potential impact under a top-down, administrative-mandate structure, in which teachers are given in-service training in new technologies and configurations and then expected to implement reforms with no particular say in the decisions that led to the mandate. The room for creative restructuring at the level of the school site is clearly at the point of design of organizational schemes that secure teacher buy-in concerning all aspects of educational reform and resource allocation to implement those reforms (Skrtic, 1988).

Conley (1988) found four critical domains that must be influenced directly by teachers in a shared-decision model: (a) organizational resource allocation; (b) work allocation (e.g., school assignments); (c) professional-organizational interface (i.e., grading policies, staff hiring); and (d) teaching process (curriculum, textbooks, etc.). Greater teacher authority in these realms implies different organizational studies to support the process. Similarly, Lieberman (1988) pointed to the need to pay careful attention to sociological aspects of organiza-



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tion theory in moving toward shared-decision models that emphasize greater teacher authority and professionalism, because some arrangements are likely to operate more effectively than others.

Perhaps the most comprehensive resource to emerge to date on all of the myriad issues that face conversion to shared-decision models is that provided by Marburger (1985). The issue of "management councils" is discussed in detail, with particular concern given to membership; size issues; selection or election processes for membership; processes for selection of membership from the community; relationship of the management council to the district office, school board, and community agencies; the role of the principal; and the conflict-resolution issues surrounding the school accountability criteria with respect to the position of the principal and his or her relationship to the management council, council products and procedures, and issues concerned with budgeting and allocation of time for participation on the council (Sailor et al., in press-a, in press-b; Sykes, 1990).

### Full Infusion and Coordination of All Available Resources

The third set of operations characterizing some school restructuring models pertains to the issue of resource reconfiguration and management. The best teachers working with the most advanced curriculum and with effective teaching practices still cannot hope to reverse the processes that place students at risk for school failure and dropout without adequate resources, particularly when class sizes are high. The needs of children at risk are many, and human resources in general education are typically too few. Many of those human resources needed for the educational improvement of all children are locked up in federal categorical programs that are designed to benefit relatively few students, and often historically in isolation. The major policy issue at stake here is whether those students for whom categorical resources are tagged can have their specialized needs met in a manner that allows all students at the school to benefit from those programs (Sapon-Shevin, 1988; Shaw et al., 1990).

An examination of special education resource allocation, as one categorical program, provides a case in point. In fiscal year 1987, 4.4 million students were served in special education in the U.S. at an annual cost for that year of $1.338 billion (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989). The process of referral and placement of these students varies so widely and haphazardly around the country, according to one report, that at times it seems to approximate pure chance (Ysseldyke, 1983). The Council of Great City Schools in 1986, for example, reported that referral rates for special education programs in the nation's large cities varied between 7.8% and 91.8% (Council of Great City Schools, 1986). The problem of identifying who is truly in need of special education resources is significant, and raises serious questions as to whether expensive resources are being largely mismanaged or misapplied. For example, as a category, learning disabilities (LD) increased 142% between 19[illegible] and 198[illegible], whereas special education as a whole increased only 20% in the same period. LD now describes around 44% of all students identified nationally for special education services.

- More than 80% of the student population could be classified as learning disabled by one or more definitions presently in use (Ysseldyke, 198[illegible])
- Based upon the records of those already certified as learning disabled and those not, experienced evaluators could not tell the difference (Davis & Shepard, 1983)
- Students identified as learning disabled cannot be shown to differ from other low achievers on a wide variety of school-related characteristics (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 1983; Bartoli & Botel, 1988; Ysseldyke, Algozzine, Shinn, & Mcgue, 1982). (U.S. Department of Education, 1989, p. 9)

A further complication in the referral and placement of students for special education services is to be found in the continuing overrepresentation of students of various racial and ethnic groups. In the 1986–198[illegible] school year, minority populations represented 30% of all U.S. public school students, but made up 42% of special education students labeled as educable mentally retarded (EMR). This proportion was particularly overbalanced for students of African-American descent, who made up 16% of the public school population but 35% of the EMR subpopulation within special education, according to a 1988 national survey (Hume, 1988d, 1988e).

The question of misidentification of pupils for specialized resources might not present such a monumental concern for school restructuring if these students' educational needs were being met in the mainstream, but such is not the case. In the 1985–1986 school year, barely one-fourth of all students served in special education nationally received those services in general education classrooms and other general instructional environments (Hume, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c). For most special education students, their program is a separate pull-out or send-off effort for most of the school day. If special education students and their relatively rich mix of resources are pulled out of mainstream education, the relevant question of interest becomes, do they so benefit from this educational apartheid? Lipsky and Gartner (1989) in a review of the literature on special education efficacy concluded:

> Reviews and meta-analyses . . . consistently report little or no benefit for students of all levels of

> severity placed in special education settings (Carlberg & Kavale, 1980; Cegelka & Tyler, 1970; Epps & Tindal, 1987; Glass, 1983; Kavale & Glass, 1982; Leinhardt & Pallay, 1982; Madden & Slavin, 1982, 1983; Semmel, Gottlieb, & Robinson, 1979; Ysseldyke, 1987). Even the authors of a petulant attack on challenges to present special education practices offer little to defend them (Kauffman, Lloyd, & McKinney, 1988). (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989, p. 19)

If special education in separate pull-out programs is a relative failure (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989), and, conversely, the success rate is demonstrably higher in general education program applications (Hagerty & Abramson, 1987; Slavin & Madden, 1989), then the question arises as to whether coordinating special education resources within the general education program might indeed benefit all students. Slavin (1990), for example, showed that special education students profited significantly in a range of educational outcomes from inclusion in cooperative learning groups at the elementary school level when compared with similar students in a special class situation, and without any loss to the general education students in the group. In a report that generated much controversy, Wang (1988) found similar results in a comprehensive series of studies of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM), a general education–based delivery system.

Resource infusion as a set of restructuring operations thus reflects the existing knowledge base concerning the comparative efficacy of keeping federal categorical programs within their diverse resources, such as represented by special education, closely coordinated with and infused into the general education program so that benefits might accrue to both general education and categorically identified students. As yet, however, there is no data base with which to refute or support the attribution of benefits for general education students resulting from a full infusion of special education resources. Finally, thre is an obvious need to protect the statutory and regulatory requirements, including due process mechanisms in P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 99-457, within the specified operations of resource infusion. School restructuring efforts are a failure if there are no demonstrable improvements in the educational programs and performances of special education students, as well as the general student population at the school. Some states (e.g., California) have passed laws designed to facilitate these kinds of school restructuring efforts in a manner that protects the specific federal requirements for each program category.

## Community Participation in the Life of the School

The fourth component of typical school restructuring models involves the extent to which the school can successfully regain its all-but-lost status as a fundamental mainstay of the community it serves (Sailor, 1990). This component has a particular relevance for the potential of its impact on children at risk for school failure and dropout. The work of Clark (1983, 1989) presents an example of community participation in restructuring. Clark developed strategies to involve the families, single parents, and foster care providers of African-American children in predominantly poor, multiethnic, minority school districts in their children's academic life in the school. His efforts, particularly in math and reading through parent involvement in homework, paid off in greatly improved test performances of his subjects and reduced status for being at risk. Clark (1989) was able to show that illiterate parents can nevertheless stimulate a child's reading and writing skills by, for example, focusing the child's attention on stories invented by the parents to nonword picture story books.

Many community involvement strategies are focused on the problem of high school dropout. Among the factors most closely associated with high school dropout has been the perception of school as a relatively valueless place in the eyes of families of children at risk in earlier grade levels (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1989). If school is a place where children of poverty are viewed negatively by teachers and administrators, and where parents are held accountable for these perceived problems by being furnished with detention slips, requests to come in for disciplinary discussions, threats of suspension, and so on, then parents will come to view the school as mainly a place of bad news and harassment. Such a view is soon communicated to the child, and the school comes to have a negative value.

Community involvement is required, as a key component of restructuring, in such diverse areas as improved health care for young children, provision of preschool and infant support services, case management and child protective services (Hickey, Lockwood, Payzant, & Wenrich, 1990), parent involvement in school decision-making councils, community volunteer participation in middle and junior high schools (Vasquez, 1990a, 1990b), and the involvement of business and industry in the process of transition from school to adult status at the secondary school level (Sailor et al., 1989). This list taps but a few of the significant ways that members of the community can enhance the life of a school under restructuring and identification of services to meet children's specific health care needs (Hickey et al., 1990).

A number of federal programs are now under way that significantly augment the community involvement effort through the restructured school. For example, the Comprehensive Child Development Program will supply $19,760,000 per year through fiscal year 1993 for the funding of 10 to 25 projects for intensive, comprehensive, integrated, and continuous support ser-

vices for low-income infants, toddlers, preschoolers, parents, and other household members. Under the Medicaid expansion program, pregnant women and young children under the age of 1 year who have poverty-level income will be eligible for Medicaid. P.L. 99-457, which extends Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) entitlements to early childhood at-risk (for disability) children, and the Family Support Law of 1989 greatly augment services potentially harnessed through the schools to young children. The latter requires the states to provide more systematic support to recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and to establish a Basic Skills (JOBS) program. Under this law, states are required to evaluate the level of child care necessary to permit parents to engage in education, training activities, or work.

The critical need to expand and coordinate children's services through the schools is highlighted by the extent to which many children eligible for entitlement programs are not presently recipients of these programs (Kagan, 1989; Leichter, 1979; Lightfoot, 1987; McLaughlin & Shields, 1987; Seeley, 1981). Sixty percent of families headed by single mothers with children under 6 are living in poverty. These children are three times more likely to die in infancy than are other children; four times more likely to become pregnant as teenagers; far more likely to suffer serious illness, abuse, neglect, and to drop out of school than are their economically sufficient counterparts. Yet, in California research shows that less than half of all eligible children in that state receive AFDC income (Wald, Evans, & Ventresca, 1989).

## Community Involvement in Secondary Education

Community involvement at the high school level is often heavily focused on the foundation of new partnerships between business/industry and the schools to facilitate the transition of students into adult status. Central to high school restructuring around transitional services is the regrouping of traditional vocational educational programs (Kadamus & Daggett, 1986). Examples of restructuring in high schools in Boston (Dentzer & Wheelock, 1990) and in New York (Kadamus & Daggett, 1986) have indicated how vocational education resources can be effectively reorganized to facilitate the movement of students into the workplace or into higher education through partnership arrangements between high schools and business/industry councils, or between high schools and higher education agencies.

Integrated learning environments, for example, can provide a vehicle for blending community and school resources into a common planning framework that has a significant, measurable impact on the reduction of high school dropout (Fillmore, in press; Flynn, 1989). Collaboration between high schools and such agencies as the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) and Department of Developmental Services (DDS) or their equivalents, together with business and industry groups, has led to recent strong movements in vocational education to create direct community job experiences within career employment opportunities for high school students (Siegel, 1988; Siegel & Gaylord-Ross, 1991), and the creation of transition specialists within high schools whose jobs call for the development of career-linkage plans for categorical students and students at risk for dropout (Sailor et al., 1989).

## Comprehensive Local School (CLS)

The California Research Institute (CRI) at San Francisco State University began the development of an approach to school restructuring in 1985, which was widely disseminated in 1989 with the publication of the text, *The Comprehensive Local School: Regular Education for All Students with Disabilities* (Sailor et al., 1989). This model, which began with efforts to socially integrate students with severe disabilities into the life of regular schools, has expanded over the past 3 years to a model of school restructuring that is strongly geared to coordinated management of categorical resources to the collective advantage of all students at the school site; hence, the term *comprehensive* local school.

The CLS approach has five distinct components, each of which is geared to a specific age group in the educational continuum. School organization and restructuring is thus examined in terms of issues affecting (a) early childhood programs, (b) elementary programs, (c) middle school or junior high school programs, (d) secondary programs, and (e) postsecondary educational programs.

Comprehensive Local School as an approach to school restructuring has two principal features that distinguish it from many other models. First, CLS envisions the school as the coordinating vehicle for all children's services, going beyond traditional educational issues to encompass health and social service issues as well (Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990; Morrill & Gerry, 1990). Schools under this model gradually progress toward becoming comprehensive, interdisciplinary children's service centers, with education making up the primary service around which other services, including case management and health-related services, are configured according to need (Hickey et al., 1990). Second, CLS functions as a comprehensive, unified educational vehicle with all categorical programs reconfigured and coordinated at the school site under a strong site-based management system characterized by a shared decision-making process.

## Conclusions

Those special educators associated with, or indeed committed to the current directions in reform, such as those indicated by the LRE mandate for social and academic integration and the retention of special education students in general education classrooms, might well consider forming a strong alliance with the school restructuring process under way in the dominant reform movement within general education. With an increasing likelihood of further progress in special education reform being closely linked with (if not co-opted by) processes of change in the bigger picture of general school organizational reform, an opportunity exists to realign all educational systems to work more effectively and efficiently for all children at the school site. The inherent danger to special educators who choose to maintain the status quo and to wait this one out is to ultimately witness the possibility of a takeover of special education programs and funding by an increasingly troubled and strained general education system that is ill-equipped to utilize effectively special education and other federal categorical resources to benefit the increasingly diverse population it is intended to serve.

In terms of federal policy, special education, as a field, is at a crossroads. The pressing reform movement in general education can result in an expanded use of special education as a separate system (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989). An expansion in eligibility of the number of types of categorically defined students with special needs, for example, offers one possibility. The present debate over whether Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) should be included is a case in point. Expansion in special education eligibility could lead to a condition under which as many as 25% to 30% of public school enrollment is served by a separate special education delivery system.

Alternatively, reform efforts within special education to achieve greater levels of integration within general education offer the more attractive possibility for a shared educational agenda for all students. By a more judicious and efficient application of special education and other federal, categorical program resources at the local school site level, these resources might well be reconfigured under school restructuring efforts to better meet the needs of all students at the school.

**Wayne Sailor**, *PhD, directs the California Research Institute at San Francisco State University (SFSU), a 5-year research and technical assistance institute concerned with the integration of students with severe disabilities into general education classrooms and schools. He is also site director of the SFSU Research and Training Center for Community-Referenced Behavior Management Technologies for Students with Severe Disabilities.*

*Dr. Sailor is a professor of teacher education at SFSU and is also co-coordinator of the Joint Doctoral Program in Special Education with the University of California at Berkeley. A member of the editorial board of The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, Dr. Sailor is also senior author of the book The Comprehensive Local School (published by Paul H. Brookes, 1989), which is concerned with issues and models of general school service delivery for all students with disabilities. Address: Wayne Sailor, San Francisco State University, 612 Font Blvd., San Francisco, CA 94132.*

## Author's Notes

1. Preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by the Office of Special Education & Rehabilitation Services (GOO8°C3056). No official endorsement should be inferred.
2. The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions of Lorie Goetz and Tricia Karasoff in the development of this manuscript.

## References

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1983). Learning disabilities as a subset of school failure: The over-sophistication of a concept. *Exceptional Children, 50,* 242–246.

Bartoli, J., & Botel, M. (1988). *Reading/learning disability: An ecological approach.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J.J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. *Remedial and Special Education, 10*(2), 17–22.

Bickel, W.E., & Bickel, D.D. (1986). Effective schools, classrooms, and instruction: Implications for special education. *Exceptional Children, 52,* 489–500.

Biklen, D., Bogdan, R., Ferguson, D., Searl, S., & Taylor, S. (1985). *Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Braaten, S., Kauffman, J.M., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, C.M. (1988). The Regular Education Initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children, 55*(1), 21–27.

Brinker, R.P., & Thorpe, M.E. (1984). *Evaluation of the integration of severely handicapped students in regular education and community settings* (Research Rep.). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Davis, L., VanDeventer, P., Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F., Gruenewald, L., & Jorgensen, J. (1989a). The home school: Why students with severe intellectual disabilities must attend the schools of their brothers, sisters, friends, and neighbors. *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14,* 1–7.

Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Schwarz, P., VanDeventer, P., Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F., Gruenewald, L., & Jorgensen, J. (1989b). Should students with severe intellectual disabilities be based in regular or in special edu-

cation classrooms in home schools? *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14*, 8–12.

Burton, T., & Hirschoren, A. (1979). *Education of severely and profoundly handicapped children: Are we sacrificing the child to the concept?* Paper presented for the Council of Exceptional Children, Reston, VA.

California State Department of Education. (1989, December). *The challenge for the '90s: The California framework for special education programs and services* (Draft). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Campbell, P.H., & Bailey, K. (in press). Issues in health care in the education of students with the most severe disabilities. In M. Wang, H. Walberg, & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of special education* (vol. IV). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Carlberg, C., & Kavale, K. (1980). The efficacy of special versus regular class placement for exceptional children: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Special Education, 14*, 295–309.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). *An imperiled generation: Saving urban schools*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.

Cegelka, W.J., Tyler, J. (1970). The efficacy of special class placement for mentally retarded in proper perspective. *Training School Bulletin, 66*, 33–66.

Cistone, P.J., Fernandez, J.A., & Tornillo, P.L. (1989). School-based management/shared decision making in Dade County (Miami). *Education and Urban Society, 21*(4), 393–402.

Clark, R.M. (1983). *Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, R.M. (1989). *The role of parents in assuring education success in restructuring efforts* (Draft). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Cohen, M. (1988). *Restructuring the education system: Agenda for the 1990s*. Washington, DC: National Governor's Association.

Committee for Economic Development. (1987). *Children in need*. Washington, DC: Committee for Economic Development.

Conley, S. (1988). Reforming paper pushers and avoiding free agents: The teacher as a constrained decision-maker. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24*(4), 393–404.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1989, November). *Success for all in a new century: A report by the Council of Chief State School Officers on Restructuring Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Great City Schools. (1986). *Special education: Views from America's cities*. Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.

Cruickshank, W.M. (1977). Least restrictive placement: Administrative wishful thinking. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10*, 193–194.

Danielson, L.C., & Bellamy, G.T. (1989). State variation in placement of children with handicaps in segregated environments. *Exceptional Children, 55*(5), 398–455.

David, J. (1990, February). What is restructuring? *Work-America, 7*(2), 1.

David, J., Cohen, M., Honetschlager, D., & Traiman, S. (1990). *State actions to restructure schools: First steps*. Washington, DC: National Governor's Association, Center for Policy Research.

Davis, W.A., & Shepard, L.A. (1983). Specialists' use of test and clinical judgment in the diagnosis of learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 19*, 128–138.

Davis, W.E., & McCaul, E.J. (1990, January). *At-risk children and youth: A crisis in our schools and society* [Monograph]. Orono: Institute for the Study of At-Risk Students, Maine Department of Educational Services and the College of Education, University of Maine.

Dentzer, E., & Wheelock, A. (1990, March). *Locked in locked out: Tracking and placement practices in Boston Public Schools*. Boston: Massachusetts Advocacy Center.

Downing, J., & Eichinger, J. (1990). Instructional strategies for learners with dual sensory impairments in integrated settings. *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15*(2), 98–105.

Durkin, D. (1990). Matching classroom instruction with reading abilities: An unmet need. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(3), 23–28.

Elmore, R.F., & Associates. (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Epps, S., & Tindal, G. (1987). The effectiveness of differential programming in serving students with mild handicaps: Placement options and instructional programming. In M.C. Wang, M.C. Reynolds, & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *The handbook of special education* (vol. 1, pp. 213–248). New York: Pergamon Press.

Falvey, M.A. (1989). *Community-based curriculum: Instructional strategies for students with severe handicaps* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Brookes.

Filmore, L.W. (in press). Now or later? Issues related to the early education of minority group children. In C. Harris (Ed.), *Children at risk* (pp. 110–133). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Fine, M. (1983). Perspectives on inequity: Voices from urban schools. In L. Bicklman (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual IV*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Fine, M. (1987). Silencing in public schools. *Language Arts, 64*(2).

Flynn, G. (1989, October). *The Waterloo story*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of TASH, Chicago.

Forest, M. (1987). *More education integration*. Downsview, Ontario: G. Allan Roeher Institute.

Forest, M., & Lusthaus, E. (1989). Promoting educational equality for all students: Circles and maps. In W. Stainback, S. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education* (pp. 43–57). Baltimore: Brookes.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D.K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 367–395.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D.K. (1990a). Students as instructional agents. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education* (pp. 81–93). Baltimore: Brookes.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D.K. (1990b). *The yoke of special education: How to break it* (Paper, Federal Role Series). Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Garvar-Pinhas, A., & Pedhazur Schmelkin, L. (1989). Administrators' and teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. *Remedial and Special Education, 10*(4), 38–43.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gaylord-Ross, R. (1987). School integration for students with mental handicaps: A cross-cultural perspective. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 2*(2).

Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1990). Rethinking the Regular Education Initiative: Focus on the classroom teacher. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(3), 7–16.

Gilhool, T.K. (1989). The right to an effective education: From Brown to PL 94-142 and beyond. In D. Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.), *Beyond separate education: Quality education for all* (pp. 243–253). Baltimore: Brookes.

Gilhool, T.K., & Stutman, E.A. (1978). Integration of severely handicapped students: Toward criteria for implementing and enforcing the integration imperative of PL 94-142 and Section 504. In *Developing criteria for the evaluation of the least restrictive environment provision*. Washington, DC: State Program Studies Branch, Division of Innovation and Development, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Education.

Glass, G.V. (1983). Effectiveness of special education. *Policy Studies Review, 2*, 65–78.

Glatthorn, A.A. (1990a). Cooperative professional development: Facilitating the growth of the special education teacher and the classroom teacher. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(3), 29–34.

Glatthorn, A.A. (1990b). Cooperative professional development: A tested approach, not a panacea. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(4), 62.

Goetz, L., & Sailor, W. (1990). Much ado about babies, murky bath water, and trickle down politics: A reply to Kauffman. *The Journal of Special Education, 24*(3), 334–339.

Gottlieb, J. (1981). Mainstreaming: Fulfilling the promise? *Journal of Mental Deficiency, 86*(2), 115–126.

Hagerty, G.J., & Abramson, M. (1987). Impediments to implementing national policy change for mildly handicapped students. *Exceptional Children, 53*(4), 315–324.

Halvorsen, A.T., & Sailor, W. (1990). Integration of students with severe and profound disabilities: A review of research. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), *Issues and Research in Special Education* (vol. I, pp. 110–172). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hamre-Nietupski, S., Nietupski, J., & Maurer, S. (1990). A comprehensive state education agency plan to promote the integration of students with moderate/severe handicaps. *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15*, 106–113.

Haring, K., Farron-Davis, F., Karasoff, P., Zeph, L., Goetz, L., & Sailor, W. (in press). *LRE and placement*. Manuscript submitted for publication, San Francisco State University, Department of Special Education, California Research Institute.

Haring, N., & Bricker, D. (Eds.). (1978). *Teaching the severely handicapped* (vol. III). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Haring, N.G., & Brown, L. (Eds.). (1976). *Teaching the severely handicapped* (vol. I). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Haring, N., & Brown, L. (Eds.). (1977). *Teaching the severely handicapped* (vol. II). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Haywood, H. (1981). Reducing social vulnerability is the challenge of the eighties (AAMD Presidential Address). *Mental Retardation, 19*(4), 190–195.

Hickey, N.W., Lockwood, J., Payzant, T.W., & Wenrich, J.W. (1990, July). *New beginnings: A feasibility study of integrated services for children and families* (Final report). San Diego, CA: City, County of San Diego, San Diego City Schools, San Diego Community College District.

Hodginson, H.L. (1985). *All one system: Demographics of education—Kindergarten through graduate school*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hume, M. (1988a, March 4). Another year increases the demands on special education, report shows. *Education Daily, 21*(43), 7–8.

Hume, M. (1988b, March 15). Despite progress, states have problems to overcome in special education. *Education Daily, 21*(50), 1–3.

Hume, M. (1988c, June 29). Experts debate progress in mainstreaming handicapped children. *Education Daily, 21*(125), 3–4.

Hume, M. (1988d, August 16). Found violating disabled students' rights, Chicago could lose $117 million. *Education Daily, 21*(158), 3–4.

Hume, M. (1988e, February 17). OCR data shows minorities overrepresented among disability groups. *Education Daily, 21*(31), 5–6.

Idol, L., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Nevin, A. (1986). *Collaborative consultation*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Jenkins, J.R., & Jenkins, L.M. (1981). *Cross-age and peer tutoring: Help for children with learning problems*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Kadamus, J.A., & Daggett, W.R. (1986). *New directions for vocational education at the secondary level* (Information Series No. 311). Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Kagan, S.L. (1989, October). Early care and education: Beyond the schoolhouse doors. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 107–112.

Karasoff, P., & Kelly, D. (1989). What makes integration work? *STRATEGIES Bulletin, 1*(1), 1–2.

Kauffman, J.M. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative as Reagan-Bush education policy: A trickle-down theory of education of the hard-to-teach. *The Journal of Special Education, 23*(3), 256–278.

Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1989). Arguable assumptions underlying the Regular Education Initiative. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21*, 6–11.

Kauffman, J.M., & Hallahan, D.P. (1990). What we want for children: A rejoinder to REI proponents. *The Journal of Special Education, 24*(3), 340–345.

Kauffman, J.M., Lloyd, J.W., & McKinney, J.D. (Eds.). (1988). *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 2*(1). [Special issue]

Kavale, J.A., & Glass, G.V. (1982). The efficacy of special education interventions and practices: A compendium of meta-analysis findings. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 15*(4), 1–14.

Kirst, M.W., & McLaughlin, M. (1990). Rethinking policy for children: Implications for educational administration. In D. Mitchell & L.L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership in changing contexts of families, communities, and schools. 89th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II)* (pp. 69–90). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Knapp, M.S., & Turnbull, B.J. (1990, January). *Better schooling for the children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom* (vol. I: Summary). Study of Academic Instruction for Disadvantaged Students by SRI International and Policy Studies Associates (Contract No.

LC88054001). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget & Evaluation.

Leichter, H.J. (Ed.). (1979). *Families and communities as educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Leinhardt, G., & Pallay, A. (1982). Restrictive educational settings: Exile or haven? *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 557–578.

Levin, H.M. (1985). *The educationally disadvantaged: A national crisis* (The State Youth Initiatives, Project Working Paper No. 6). Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Levin, H.M. (1989). Cost-effectiveness and educational policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10*(1), 51–69.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Building a professional culture in schools* (Report). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1987). *Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools*. New York: Basic Books.

Lipsky, D.K., & Gartner, A. (1989). *Beyond separate education: Quality education for all*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Lowenbraun, S., Madge, S., & Affleck, J. (1990). Parental satisfaction with integrated class placements for special education and general education students. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(4), 37–40.

MDC, Inc. (1988). *America's shame, America's hope: Twelve million youth at risk* (Report prepared for the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation). Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.L. (1982). *Count me in: Academic achievement and social outcomes of mainstreaming students with mild academic handicaps*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.L. (1983). Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic achievement and social outcomes. *Review of Educational Research, 53*, 519–569.

Mamary, A., & Rowe, L. (1989, January). *The outcome-driven developmental model (A program for comprehensive school improvement)*. Johnson City, NY: Johnson City Central School District.

Marburger, C.L. (1985). *One school at a time: School based management, a process for change*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

McDill, E.L., Natriello, G., & Pallas, A.M. (1986). A population at risk: Potential consequences of tougher school standards for student dropouts. In G. Natriello (Ed.), *School dropouts: Patterns and policies* (pp. 106–147). New York: Teachers College Press.

McDonnell, L., & Pascal, A. (1988). *Teacher unions and educational reform* (Rep. No. FRE-02). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp., Center for Policy Research in Education/ Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Shields, P.M. (1987). Involving low-income parents in the schools: A role for policy? *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 156–160.

McLeskey, J., Skiba, R., & Wilcox, B. (1990). Reform and special education: A mainstream perspective. *The Journal of Special Education, 24*(3), 319–325.

McNulty, B.A. (Producer). (1990). *Learning together* [Videotape]. Denver: Colorado Department of Education.

Meyer, L., Peck, C., & Brown, L. (1990). *Critical issues in the lives of persons with disabilities*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Miller, L. (1990). The Regular Education Initiative and school reform: Lessons from the mainstream. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(3), 17–22.

Morrill, W.A., & Gerry, M.H. (1990, February 6). *Integrating the delivery of services to school-aged children at risk: Toward a description of American experience and experimentation*. Paper presented at Conference on Children and Youth at Risk sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development, Washington, DC.

National Center on Education and the Economy. (1989). *To secure our future: The federal role in education*. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

National School Boards Association. (1989). *A equal chance: Educating at-risk children to succeed* [Monograph]. Alexandria, VA: Author.

*New Partnerships: Education's Stake in the Family Support Act of 1988*. (1988). Washington, DC: WTG.

Rose, M. (1989). *Lives on the boundary: The struggles and achievements of America's underprepared*. New York: The Free Press (Macmillan).

Sailor, W. (1989). Transition in Italy. *New Ways*, Fall, 10–11, 13.

Sailor, W. (1990). Community school: An essay. In L. Meyer, C. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), *Critical issues in the lives of persons with disabilities* (pp. 379–385). Baltimore: Brookes.

Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Halvorsen, A.T., Doering, K., Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). *The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Sailor, W., Gee, K., Graham, N., & Goetz, L. (1988). Progress in educating students with the most severe disabilities: Is there any? *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13*(2), 87–99.

Sailor, W., Gerry, M., & Wilson, W.C. (in press-a). Disability and school integration. In T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies* (2nd suppl.). New York: Pergamon Press.

Sailor, W., Gerry, M., & Wilson, W.C. (in press-b). Policy implications of emergency full inclusion models for the education of students with severe disabilities. In M. Wang, H. Walberg, & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *The handbook of special education* (vol. IV). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Sailor, W., Wilcox, B., & Brown, L. (Eds.). (1980). *Methods of instruction for severely handicapped students*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1988). Working towards merger together: Seeing beyond distrust and fear. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 11*, 103–110.

Schoor, L.B. (1988). *Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantaged*. New York: Doubleday.

Seeley, D. (1981). *Education through partnership: Mediating structures and education*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Semmel, M.Y., & Gerber, M.M. (1990). If at first you don't succeed, bye, bye again: A response to general educators' views on the REI. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(4), 53–59.

Shaw, S.F., Biklen, D., Conlon, S., Dunn, J., Kramer, J., & DeRoma-Wagner, V. (1990). Special education and school reform. In L.M. Bullock & R.L. Simpson (Eds.), *Critical issues in special education: Implications for personnel preparation* (pp. 12–25). Denton: University of North Texas.

Siegel, S. (1988). The career ladder program: Implementing re-ED principles in vocational settings. *Behavioral Disorders, 14*(1), 16.

Siegel, S., & Gaylord-Ross, R. (1991). Factors associated with employment success among youth with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 24,* 40–47.

Singer, J.D. (1988). Should special education merge with regular education? *Educational Policy, 2,* 409–424.

Singer, J.D., & Butler, J.A. (1987). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act: Schools as agents of social reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 125–152.

Sirotnik, K.A., & Clark, R. (1988, May). School-centered decision making and renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan,* pp. 660–664.

Skrtic, T.M. (1988). The organizational context of special education. In E.L. Meyen & T.M. Skrtic (Eds.), *Exceptional children and youth: An introduction* (pp. 479–517). Denver: Love.

Skrtic, T. (1990). *Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization.* Denver: Love.

Slavin, R.E. (1989). Students at risk of school failure: The problem and its dimensions. In R. Slavin, N. Karweit, & N. Madden (Eds.), *Effective programs for students at risk* (pp. 3–19). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E. (1990). General education under the Regular Education Initiative: How must it change? *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(3), 40–50.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1989). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis. *Educational Leadership, 46,* 14–20.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Livermon, B.J., & Dolan, L. (1990). *Success for all: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for reforming urban education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Slavin, R.E., Stevens, R.J., & Madden, N.A. (1988). Accommodating student diversity in reading and writing instruction: A cooperative learning approach. *Remedial and Special Education, 9*(1), 60–66.

Snell, M.E. (Ed.). (1978). *Systematic instruction of the moderately and severely handicapped.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Sontag, E. (Ed.). (1977). *Educational programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped.* Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (1989). *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education.* Baltimore: Brookes.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education.* Baltimore: Brookes.

Sykes, G. (1990). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools. In R. Elmore (Ed.), *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform* (pp. 59–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thousand, J.S., & Villa, R.A. (1989). Enhancing success in heterogeneous schools. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education* (pp. 89–104). Baltimore: Brookes.

U.S. Department of Education. (1989). *Tenth annual report to Congress.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Vandercook, T., York, J., & Forest, M. (1989). The McGill Action Planning System (MAPS): A strategy for building the vision. *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14,* 205–215.

Vasquez, B.T. (1990a). *A generic model of school-wide collaboration.* San Francisco: San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco School Volunteers.

Vasquez, B.T. (1990b). *Effective placement of students with special needs in the regular classroom through organizational development and cooperative learning.* San Francisco: San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco School Volunteers.

Vergason, G., & Anderegg, M.L. (in press). Save the baby! An answer to integrating children of the second system. *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Vitello, S.J. (1989). *Special education in integration in Italy: Parent and teacher viewpoints.* Unpublished manuscript. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Vladero, D. (1990, June 6). Learning-disabled students found to fare poorly. *Education Week, IX*(37), pp. 23, 25.

Wald, N.S., Evans, J.H., & Ventresca, M.J. (1989). Economic status. In M.H. Kirst (Project Director), *Conditions of children in California.* Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Wang, M.C. (1988). Weighing the "Regular Education Initiative." *Education Week, 7,* 28, 36.

Wang, M.C., & Peverly, S. (1987). The role of the learner: An individual difference variable in school learning and functioning. In M. Wang, M. Reynolds, & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Handbook of special education: Research and practice. Vol. I: Learner characteristics and adaptive education* (pp. 59–92). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Wang, M.C., Reynolds, M., & Walberg, H.J. (1986). Rethinking special education. *Educational Leadership, 44*(1), 26–31.

Wang, M., Reynolds, M., & Walberg, H. (1988, November). Integrating the children of the second system. *Phi Delta Kappan,* pp. 248–251.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. *Exceptional Children, 52*(5), 411–415.

Williams, W., Fox, W., Christie, L., Thousand, J., Conn-Powers, M., Carmichael, L., Vogelsberg, R.T., & Hull, M. (1986). Community integration in Vermont. *The Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11,* 294–299.

Winget, P. (Ed.). (1990). Education programs must integrate to benefit all students at every school, says Honig. *The Special Edge, 4*(7), 1, 3–4.

York, R., & Edgar, E. (Eds.). (1979). *Teaching the severely handicapped* (vol. IV). Seattle, WA: American Association for the Education of the Severely/Profoundly Handicapped.

Ysseldyke, J.E. (1983). Current practices in making psychoeducational decisions about learning disabled students. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 16,* 29–31.

Ysseldyke, J.E. (1987). Classification of handicapped students. In M. Wang, M. Reynolds, & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Handbook of special education: Research and practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 253–271). New York: Pergamon Press.

Ysseldyke, J.E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M.R., & Mcgue, M. (1982). Similarities and differences between low achievers and students classified as learning disabled. *The Journal of Special Education, 16,* 73–85.

# SECTION TWO

## Restructuring Organizations

**Accelerated Schools Project**
402 S. CERAS
Stanford University, CA 94305-3084
(415) 725-1669; 1676

**American Federation of Teachers**
Center for Restructuring
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 879-4440

**Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development**
1250 N. Pitt Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 549-9110

**Center for Educational Renewal**
College of Education, DQ-12
Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

**Center for Leadership in School Reform**
950 Breckenridge Lane, Suite 200
Louisville, KY 40207
(502) 895-1942

**Child Study Center**
230 S. Frontage Road
Box 3333
New Haven, CT 06510
(203) 785-2548

**Coalition of Essential Schools (and) Re: Learning**
Brown University
Education Department, Box 1938
Providence, RI 02912

**National Alliance for Restructuring Education (of the) National Center on Education & the Economy**
1341 "G" Street, N.W., Suite 1020
Washington, D.C.
(202) 783-3668

**National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, & Teaching (NCREST)**
NYC Center for School Reform
Teachers College, Columbia University
525 W. 120th Street, Box 110
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-3432

**National Education Association**
National Center for Innovation in Education
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3290
(202) 822-7783, x7940

**Panasonic Partnership Program**
Panasonic Foundation
1 Panasonic Way
Secaucus, NJ 07094
(201) 392-1432

**Program for School Improvement**
College of Education, Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
(404) 542-2516

# SECTION THREE

## National List of Schools Engaged in Restructuring

ALASKA

Robert Gottstein
WISE Project
310 K St.
Anchorage AK
99501

ALABAMA

Carolynn Akers
Junior League of Mobile
57 North Sea Ave.
Mobile AL
36607

ARKANSAS

James Floyd
Principal
Perryville High School
P.O. Box 129
Perryville AR
72126

Charles Tadlock
Principal
Sheridan Junior High School
500 North Rock Street
Sheridan AR
72150

Harry Wilson
Principal
Springdale Junior High School
Springdale AR
72764

Travis Case
Principal
Bald Knob Junior High School
Route 3, P.O. Box 33
Bald Knob AR
72010

John Carey
Principal
Flippin High School
P.O. Box 239
Flippin AR
72634

Mona Briggs
Principal
Woodland Junior High School
Woodland and Poplar Streets
Fayetteville AR
72701

Cecilia Johnson
Learning Coordinator
Arkansas Dept. of Education
4 Capitol Mall
Little Rock AR
72201

CALIFORNIA

Principal
Soquel High School
401 Old San Jose Rd.
Soquel CA
95073

Principal
Washington High School
801 Howard Ave.
Burlingame CA
94010

Principal
Amos Alonzo Stagg High School
621 Brookside Rd.
Stockton CA
95207

Mary Stenseth
1671 Park Ave.
San Jose CA
95126

Peter Mehas
1111 Van Ness Ave.
Fresno CA
93721

Ilene Straus
Principal
Lincoln Middle School
1501 California Avenue
Santa Monica CA
90403

Philip Bliss
Chairman
Mid-Peninsula High School
870 North California Avenue
Palo Alto CA
94303

Robert Stein
Principal
O'Farrell Community School
6130 Skyline Drive
San Diego CA
92114

Lois Jones
Principal
Oceana High School
401 Paloma Avenue
Pacifica CA
91107

Roger L. King
Coordinator
Rancho San Joaquin Middle School
4861 Michelson Road
Irvine CA
92715

Judy Cunningham
Principal
Rancho San Joaquin Middle School
4861 Michaelson Rd.
Irvine CA
92715

Mary Lou Mendoza
Principal
James Lick Middle School
1220 Noe St.
San Francisco CA
94114

David Pope
Principal
Spring View Middle School
5040 5th Street
Rocklin CA
95677

Robert Stein
Principal
O'Farrell Community School
6130 Skyline Dr.
San Diego CA
92114

James Storer
Principal
De Anza High School
5000 Valley View Rd.
Richmond CA
94025

David Marsh
Regional Coordinator
University of Southern California
W.P.H. 702
Los Angeles CA
90089-0031

Judy Codding
Principal
Pasadena High School
2925 E. Sierra Madre Blvd.
Pasadena CA
91107

Pam Watson
Acting Principal
Fremont High School
4610 Foothill Blvd.
Oakland CA
94601

Dennis Gray
Regional Coordinator
1056 Nautilus Street
LaJolla CA
92037

Chloe Kamprath
Principal
Mid-Peninsula High School
870 N. California Ave.
Palo Alto CA
94303

Mike Bowers
Principal
Arroyo High School
15701 Lorenzo Ave.
San Lorenzo CA
94580

Steve Jubb
Regional Coordinator
4189 Montgomery Street
Oakland CA
94611

Lois Jones
Principal
Oceana High School
401 Paloma Ave.
Pacifica CA
94044

Christopher Franklin
Principal
Central Jr. High School
1201 Stoneham Ave.
Pittsburg CA
94565

Tena Peterson
Principal
Longfellow Elementary School
3610 Eucalyptus
Riverside CA
92507

David Pope
Principal
Spring View Middle School
5040 5th St.
Rocklin CA
95677

Jeff Reich
Principal
Antioch High School
700 West Eighteenth St.
Antioch CA
94509

Joe Sewell
Principal
Piner High School
1700 Fulton Rd.
Santa Rosa CA
95403

Nardy Samuels
Principal
Santa Monica High School
601 Pico Blvd.
Santa Monica CA
90405

Ruth Baumann
Ontario Teachers Federation
1260 Bay Street
Toronto
Ontario CANADA
M5R 2B5

COLORADO

Gerry Baker
Principal
Woodside High School
199 Churchill Ave.
Woodside CA
94062

Tim Scully
Assistant Principal
North High School
3620 W. 182nd St.
Torrance CA
90504

Tom Maes
Superintendent
Adams County S.D. #1
591 E. 80th Ave.
Denver CO
80229

Rob Gaskill
Principal
Irvington High School
41800 Blacow
Fremont CA
94536

Bill Herrera
San Ramon Valley U.S.D.
9870 Broadmoor Dr.
San Ramon CA
94583

D. Smith
Superintendent
Buena Vista S.D. R 31
113 N. Court St.
Buena Vista CO
81211

Marilyn Loushin-Miller
Principal
Crocker Middle School
2600 Ralston Dr.
Hillsborough CA
94010

John DiPaola
Fremont Unified School District
41800 Blacow Rd.
Fremont CA
94538

Kenneth Frisbee
Superintendent
Weld County Highland RE 9
P.O. Box 68
Ault CO
80610

CANADA

Suga Moriwaki
Assistant Principal
California High School
9870 Broadmoor Dr.
San Ramon CA
94583

BERNARD BAJNOK
PRINCIPAL
BISHOP CARROLL HIGH SCHOOL
4624 RICHARD ROAD SW
CALGARY
ALBERTA CANADA
T3E 6L1

Thomas Crawford
Superintendent
Academy School District 20
7610 N. Union Blvd.
Colorado Springs CO
80920

Walter Quinn
Principal
Foothill Middle School
2755 Cedro
Walnut Creek CA
94598

Katie McGovern
The Board of Education
for the City of York
2 Trethewey Drive
City of York
Ontario CANADA
M6M 4A8

Victor Ross
Superintendent
Adams-Araphoe 28J
1085 Peoria
Aurora CO
80011

James Mitchell
Superintendent
Adams County School District #12
11285 Highline Dr.
Northglenn CO
80233

Harry Masinton
Superintendent
North Park School District R1
910 Fourth St.
Walden CO
80480

Dean Damon
Superintendent
Boulder Valley
School District RE 2
6500 E. Arapahoe
Boulder CO
80301

Jim McDermott
Superintendent
Agate School District #300
P.O. Box 66
Agate CO
80101

Durell Thompson
Superintendent
Otis R-3
P.O. Box 401
Otis CO
80743

John Meyer
Superintendent
Brighton School District 27 J
630 S. Eighth St.
Brighton CO
80601

Lillian Stanton
Superintendent
Aguilar School District R.E. 6
P.O. Box 567
Aguilar CO
81020

Glen Hanson
Superintendent
Platte Valley RE 1
P.O. Box 485
Kersey CO
80644

Douglas Johnson
Superintendent
Brush School District RE 2-J
527 Industrial Park Rd.
Brush CO
80723

Dallas Strawn
Superintendent
Lewis Palmer School District 38
146 Jefferson St.
Monument CO
80132

Keith Christy
Superintendent
Sterling Valley RE 1
119 N. 3rd Ave.
P.O. Box 910
Sterling CO
80751

George Sauter
Superintendent
Byers School District 32J
444 E. Front St.
Byers CO
80103

Superintendent
Limon Public Schools
146 Jefferson St.
Monument CO
80132

Victor Becco
Superintendent
Trinidad School District
240 North Convent
Trinidad CO
81082

Dennis Disario
Superintendent
Calhan School District RJT 1
800 Bulldog Dr.
Calahan CO
80808

Cile Chavez
Superintendent
Littleton School District #6
5776 S. Crocker St.
Littleton CO
80120

Brent Mutsch
Weld County Fort Luptron RE 8
Superintendent
301 Reynolds St.
Fort Lupton CO
80621

Leon Cummings
Superintendent
Campo School District RJT 1
480 Maple St.
Campo CO
81029

Robert Rael
Superintendent
Centennial School District R1
909 N. Main St.
San Luis CO
81152

Jane Martin
Staff Development Coordinator
Del Norte C-7
P.O. Box 159
Del Norte CO
81132

Suzanne Treece
Superintendent
East Otero R-1
P.O. Box 439
La Junta CO
81050

Johnie Dombaugh
Superintendent
Cheraw School District #31
P.O. Box 159
Cheraw CO
81030

Laddie Livingston
Superintendent
Delta County School District 50J
765 2075 Rd.
Delta CO
81416

Dan McCormick
Superintendent
Elizabeth C-1
P.O. Box 610
Elizabeth CO
80107

Robert Tschirki
Superintendent
Cherry Creek School District #5
4700 S. Yosemite St.
Engelwood CO
80111

Evie Dennis
Superintendent
Denver School District 1
900 Grant St.
Denver CO
80203

Roscoe Davidson
Superintendent
Englewood School District 1
4101 S. Bannock St.
Englewood CO
80110

Daniel Jonson
Superintendent
Clear Creek School Dist. RE 1
545 Hwy 103
Idaho Springs CO
80452

Richard O'Connell
Superintendent
Denver School District 1
131 Wilcox St.
Castle Rock CO
80104

George Bolte
Superintendent
Falcon School District 49
10850 Woodman Rd.
Falcon CO
80831

Lonnie Rogers
Superintendent
Creede Consolidated School District
P.O. Box 64
Creede CO
81130

James Federico
Superintendent
Durango School District 9R
201 E. 12th St.
Durango CO
81301

Bob Ash
Superintendent
Ft. Morgan RE 3
230 Walnut St.
Ft. Morgan CO
80701

Stephen Beaber
Superintendent
Deer Trail School
350 Second Ave.
Deer Trail CO
80105

Gary Sibigtroth
Superintendent
East Grand School District 2
299 County Rd. 61
Granby CO
80446

John Cox
Superintendent
Fountain School District 8
425 W. Alagama Ave.
Forntain CO
80209

Larry Vibber
Superintendent
Fowler School District R4J
P.O. Box 218
Fowler CO
81039

Janice K. Johnson
Superintendent
Gunnison Watershed School District
216 W. Georgia Ave.
Gunnison CO
81230

Delano Arnold
Superintendent
Akron R-1 School District
P.O. Box 429
Akron CO
80720

Charles Ewan
Superintendent
Freemont School District RE-2
403 W. 5th St.
Florence CO
81226

Jack Pendar
Superintendent
Haxtun School District RE-2J
P.O. Box 96
Haxtun CO
80731

Janet Makris
Superintendent
Alamosa School District RE 11J
209 Victoria Ave.
Alamosa CO
81101

James Hess
Superintendent
Frenchmen Re-3 School District
P.O. Box 468
Fleming CO
80728

Bruce Yoast
Superintendent
Hayden School District RE-1
Box 70
Hayden CO
81639

Terry Ally
Superintendent
Archuleta County
301 Main St.
Pagosa Springs CO
81147

Leonard Echdardt
Superintendent
Garfield School District RE-2
839 White River Rifle
Garfield CO
81650

Anton Leon Sant
Superintendent
Hi-Plains School District
P.O. Box 8
Vona CO
80861

Mary A. Ricken
Superintendent
Arriba-Flager C20
P.O. Box 218
Flagler CO
80815

Red Mosier
Superintendent
Genoa - Hugo School District
P.O. Box 247
Hugo CO
80821

Mike Hinnegan
Superintendent
Hinsdale County School District RE-1
P.O. Box 718
Lake City CO
81235

Tom Farrell
Superintendent
Aspen School District 1
715 Cemetery Lane
Aspen CO
81611

J. Timothy Waters
Superintendent
Weld//City S.D. 6
811 15th St.
Greeley CO
80631

Jasper Butero, Jr.
Superintendent
Hoehne School District R-3
P.O. Box 91
Hoehne CO
81046

Edward Schelhaas
Superintendent
Bayfield School District 10 JtR
1327 Highway 160B
Bayfield CO
81122

James M. Poole
Superintendent
Bethune School District 10 Jt R
P.O. Box 127
Bethune CO
80805

Robert Hall
Superintendent
Kim School District R88
P.O. Box 100
Kim CO
81049

Mary Apodaca
Learning Coordinator
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax
Denver CO
80203

Richard Ullom
Superintendent
Big Sandy School District 100J
609 Pueblo
Simla CO
80835

Roger Brunelli
Superintendent
La Vega School District RE-2
P.O. Box 85
La Veta CO
81055

Peggy Reynolds
Weld County
School District RE-8
301 Reynolds
Ft. Lupton CO
80621

CONNECTICUT

Leonard Hainley
Superintendent
Big Sandy 100J
P.O. Box 68
Simla CO
80835

James R. McCabe
Superintendent
Lake County School District R1
107 Spruce St.
La Veta CO
81055

Principal
Joel Barlow High School
100 Black Rock Turnpike
West Redding CT
06896

Jeanne S. Howes
Superintendent
Holyoke School District RE-1J
435 S. Morlan
Holyoke CO
80734

Bill Van Buskirk
Superintendent
Lamar District RE 2
210 W. Pearl
Lamar CO
81052

Charley Todd
Head
Watkinson School
180 Bloomfield Avenue
Hartford CT
06105-1096

Michael Hinnegan
Superintendent
Huerfano School District Re-1
611 W. 7th St.
Walsenburg CO
81089

Larry Swain
Superintendent
West End District RE2
Drawer 190
Naturita CO
81422

Eddie Davis
Principal
Weaver High School
415 Granby Street
Hartford CT
06112

Lew Finch
Superintendent
Jefferson County Schools
5375 Otis St.
Arvada CO
80002

Dick Amman
Principal
Pueblo County High School
1050 Lane 35
Pueblo CO
81006

Kenneth Martinelli
Principal
Sacred Heart High School
P.O. Box 2120
142 South Elm Street
Waterbury CT
06722

## DELAWARE

Harry H. Dukes
President - School Board
Indian River
R.D. 2, Box 236
Frankford DE
19945

Marlene James
Principal
Brookside Elementary School
Marrow Road
Newark DE
19713

Steven H. Godowsky
Principal
Hodgson Vo-Tech High School
2575 Summit Bridge Road
Newark DE
19702

Valerie Woodruff
Principal
Middletown High School
504 South Broad Street
Middletown DE
19709

George Stone
Principal
Seaford Middle School
Stein Highway
Seaford DE
19973

Rudolph Karkosak
Principal
Wilmington High School
Lancaster Ave. & Dupont Road
Wilmington DE
19807

## FLORIDA

John DeWitt
Escambia County
215 W. Garden St.
P.O. Box 1470
Pensacola FL
32597

Larry Katz
Principal
Nova Blanche Forman School
3521 Davie Road
Davie FL
33314

Mary Mitchell
Principal
Nova Eisenhower School
6501 SW 39 Street
Davie FL
33314

Steve Pomerantz
Principal
Nova High School
3602 SW College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale FL
33314

Steven Friedman
Principal
Nova Middle School
3602 SW College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale FL
33314

Frances Vandiver
Principal
Coral Springs Middle School
10300 West Wiles Road
Coral Springs FL
33076

Marcia Pann
Principal
Silver Ridge Elementary School
9100 S.W. 36 Street
Davie FL
33328

Sharon Saulis
Principal
Westchester Elementary School
12405 Royal Palm Boulevard
Coral Springs FL
33065

James Byer
Headmaster
University School of
Nova University
7500 SW 36th Street
Fort Lauderdale FL
33314

Courtney Vanderstek
Project Coordinator
Pinellas Classroom Teachers
650 Seminole Blvd.
Largo FL
34640

Charlotte Brower
Coral Springs Middle School
10300 West Wiles Rd.
Coral Springs FL
33076

## GEORGIA

Paul Smith
2175 Parklake Dr.
Atlanta GA
30345

Robert Cresswell
Principal
Salem High School
3551 Underwood Road
Conyers GA
30208

Wayne Stone
Brooks Elementary
119 Price Rd.
Brooks GA
30205

Jim Willis
Clarke Central High School
350 S. Milledge Ave.
Athens GA
30606

Hazel Ratliff
Project Coordinator
Paulding County Schools
522 Hardee Street
Dallas GA
30132

Jerry Locke
A.L. Burruss Elementary
325 Manning Rd.
Marietta GA
30064

David Hill
Douglas County
Comp. High School
8705 Campbelton St.
Douglasville GA
30134

Sandra Holbrook
Air Line Elementary
RFD 1
Bowersville GA
30516

Lynne Horton
Camp Creek Elementary
958 Cole Dr. SW
Libum GA
30247

Jim Kahrs
Duluth High School
3737 Brock Rd.
Duluth GA
30136

Audrey Wood
Barton Chapel Road Elementary
2329 Barton Chapel Rd.
Augusta GA
30906

Mike Stanton
Cedar Shoals High School
1300 Cedar Shoals Dr.
Athens GA
30610-3541

Jean Anne Marra
East Newton Elementary
2286 Dixie Rd.
Covington GA
30209

Patsy Lentz
Benton Elementary
Route 1, Box 69
Nicholson GA
30565

Leontine Espy
Central High School
2155 Napier Ave.
Macon GA
31204

Cyndy Stephens
Eastvalley Elementary
2570 Lower Roswell Rd.
Marietta GA
30067

Karen Allen
E.T. Booth Middle School
1899 Eagle Dr.
Woodstock GA
30188

Rick Little
City Park Elementary
515 S. Pentz St.
Dalton GA
30720

Gary Phillips
Fayette County High School
205 LaFayette Dr.
Fayetteville GA
30214

Len Patton
Fayette Middle School
450 Grady Ave.
Fayetteville GA
30214

Jane Robertson
Lawrenceville Elementary
122 Gwinnett Dr., SW
Lawrenceville GA
30245

Winnette Bradley
Murphy Middle School
2610 Milledgeville Rd.
Augusta GA
30904

Sharon Denero
Fowler Drive Elementary
400 Fowler Dr.
Athens GA
30601

Marie C. Washburn
Seaborn Lee Elementary
4600 Scarbrough Rd.
College Park GA
30349

Deloris Bryant-Booker
Love T. Nolan Elementary
2725 Creel Rd.
College Park GA
30349

Bonny C. Dixon
Hawkinsville High School
P.O. Box 429
Hawkinsville GA
31036

Sandra Levent
Lilburn Elementary
531 McDaniel St.
Lilburn GA
30247

Nancy Samples
R.L. Norton Elementary
3050 Carson Rd.
Snellville GA
30278

Mary Perry
Hood Avenue Elementary
490 Hood Ave.
Fayetville GA
30214

Lynne Gray
McIntosh High School
201 Walt Banks Rd.
Peachtree City GA
30269

Joy B. Williams
Patterson Elementary
P.O. Box 6
Patterson GA
31557

Jimmy G. Jordan
Jasper County Comp. High School
Post Rd.
Monticello GA
31064

Wayne Myers
Morgan County Primary
993 East Ave.
Madison GA
30650

Judi Rogers
Pinckneyville Middle School
5540 W. Jones Bridge Rd.
Norcross GA
30092

Michael McLemore
Kelsey Middle School
200 Kelsey Ave.
Griffin GA
30223

Nelda Heatherley
Mountain Park Elementary
1500 Pounds St.
Lilburn GA
30247

Judy Robinson
Pointe South Elementary
631 Flint River Rd., SW
Riverdale GA
30274

Pam Johns
South Jackson Elementary
Route 2
Athens GA
30607

Alice Fitzgerald
White County Elementary
Route 5, Box 5041
Cleveland GA
30528

Damon Lamb
Miller Middle School
210 S. 12th Ave.
Area Education Agency 6
Marshalltown IA
50158

ILLINOIS

Erma Jenkins
Swainsboro Primary
336 West Pine St.
Swainsboro GA
30401

Gretchen Reese
Windsor Forest Elementary
414 Briarcliff Circle
Savannah GA
31419

Principal
Kenwood School
1001 Stratford Dr.
Champaign IL
61821

Sharla Van Dyke
Thomas Elementary
801 Watson Blvd.
Warner Robins GA
31093

Deloris Bryant-Booker
Love T. Nolan Elementary
2725 Creel Rd.
College Park GA
30349

Principal
Westinghouse Vocational
High School
3301 Franklin Blvd.
Chicago IL
60624

IOWA

Truman Atkins
Thomas Co. Central High School
1500 U.S. 84 By-Pass
Thomasville GA
31792

Principal
Olmstead Elementary & Kindergarten
7110 Praire Ave.
Urbandale IA
50322

Harold Banser
Superintendent
LaSalle Elementary School
1165 St. Vincent Ave.
LaSalle IL
61301

Shannon Floyd
Thunderbolt Elementary
3313 Louis St.
Thunderbolt GA
31404

Mary Wilcynski
Principal
Metro High School
1212 7th Street SE
Cedar Rapids IA
52401

Bruce Bell
Principal
Anna Jonesboro High School
608 South Main Street
Anna IL
62906

Jim Colwell
Union County Elementary
451 School Circle
Blairsville GA
30512

Phil Tetzloff
Project Coordinator
Marshalltown Education Association
c/o Marshalltown High School
1602 S. Second Avenue
Marshaltown IA
50158

Charles Bowen
Principal
Broadmoor Junior High School
501 Maywood Drive
Pekin IL
61554

Russell Ballard
Principal
Carpentersville Middle School
100 Cleveland Avenue
Carpentersville IL
60110

David Bottom
Principal
Sparta High School
205 Hood Avenue
Sparta IL
62286

Lynn St. James
Principal
Lindblom Technical High School
6130 South Wolcott Avenue
Chicago IL
60636

James Miglin
Principal
Elmwood Junior/Senior High School
301 West Butternut
Elmwood IL
61529

Floyd Wyrick
Principal
Calumet High School
8131 South May Street
Chicago IL
60620

Arthur A. Cervinka
Principal
Mather High School
5935 North Lincoln Avenue
Chicago IL
60653

Jerry Blew
Principal
Lake Park High School
600 South Medinah Road
Roselle IL
60172

Roosevelt T. Burnett
Principal
Chicago Vocational High School
2100 East 87th Street
Chicago IL
60617

Jacquelin H. Simmons
Principal
Paul Robeson High School
6835 South Normal Avenue
Chicago IL
60621

James Peterson
Principal
Malta Junior/Senior High School
Lincoln Highway
Malta IL
60150

Charles Mingo
Principal
DuSable High School
4934 South Wabash Avenue
Chicago IL
60615

Juanita J. Tucker
Principal
Wendell Phillips High School
244 East Pershing Road
Chicago IL
60653

Thomas Gunning
Principal
North Middle School
5600 Godfrey Road
Godfrey IL
62035

Warner Birts
Principal
Englewood High School
6201 South Stewart Avenue
Chicago IL
60621

Constantine Kiamos
Principal
Steinmetz High School
3030 North Mobile Avenue
Chicago IL
60067

Daryl Unnasch
Principal
Roosevelt School
7560 Oak Avenue
River Forest IL
60305

Dorothy Williams
Principal
Flower Vocational High School
3545 West Fulton Boulevard
Chicago IL
60624

Robert Brazil
Principal
Sullivan High School
6631 North Bosworth Avenue
Chicago IL
60626

Warren Chapman
Learning Coordinator
Department of Education
100 West Randolph
Chicago IL
60601

Sandy Allen
Principal
Ballard High School
6000 Brownsboro Road
Louisville KY
40222

Donna Ludwig
Principal
Mayme S. Waggener High School
330 South Hubbards Lane
St. Matthews KY
40207

INDIANA

Principal
Stonybrook Junior High School
11300 E. Stonybrook Dr.
Indianapolis IN
46229

John Sizemore
Principal
Brown School
546 South First St.
Louisville KY.
40202

Charles Miller
Principal
Pleasure Ridge Park High School
5901 Greenwood Road
Pleasure Ridge KY
40258

Principal
Henry W. Eggers School
5825 Blaine Ave.
Hammond IN
46320

Gordon E. Milby
Principal
Doss High School
7601 St. Andrews Church Road
Louisville KY
40214

John Locke
Principal
Seneca High School
3510 Goldsmith Lane
Louisville KY
40220

Dave Wilkinson
Learning Coordinator
Office of Program Development
Department of Education
State House, Room 229
Indianapolis IN
46204-2798

James A. Sexton
Principal
Eastern High School
12400 Old Shelbyville Rd.
Louisville KY
40243

Terry Shinkle
Principal
Valley High School
10200 Dixie Highway
Valley Station KY
40220

KANSAS

Clark Reinke
Principal
Amanda Arnold Elementary School
1435 Hudson
Manhattan KS
66502

Marilyn Hohmann
Principal
Fairdale High School
1001 Fairdale Road
Louisville KY
40118

Lucian Yates, III
Principal
Western High School
2501 Rockford Lane
Louisville KY
40216

KENTUCKY

Donald Ingwerson
Superintendent
Attn: Clyde Caudill, Asst. to
3332 Newburg Rd.
Louisville KY
40218

Stuart Watts
Principal
Iroquios High School
4615 Taylor Blvd.
Louisville KY
40215

Debbie Riggs
Jefferson Co. Coordinator
JCPS-Gheens Academy
4425 Preston Highway
Louisville KY
40213

June Lee
Project Coordinator
Jefferson County Teachers Association
1941 Bishop Lane
Suite 902
Louisville KY
40218

James Turner, Jr.
Superintendent Caldwell Parish
P.O. Box 1019
Columbia LA
71418

Jacquelyn A. Shipp
Superintendent
Franklin Parish Schools
1809 Prairie Rd.
Winnsboro LA
71295

LOUISIANA

Phillis Crawford
Principal
Audobon Elementary
10730 Goodwood Blvd.
Baton Rouge LA
70815

L. Keith Guice
Superintendent
Catahoula Parish
P.O. Box 308
Jonesville LA
71343

Dave J. Cavalier
Superintendent
Iberia Parish Schools
1500 Jane St.
New Iberia LA
70560

P. Edward Cancienne, Jr.
Superintendent
Assumption Parish School Board
P.O. Drawer B
Napoleonville LA
70390

Bernard J. Weiss
Superintendent
East Baton Rouge Parish Schools
P.O. Box 3950
Baton Rouge LA
70821

Charles P. Bujoi
Superintendent
Iberville Parish School Board
P.O. Box 151
Plaquemine LA
70765-0151

James J. Bordelon
Superintendent
Avoyelles Parish School Board
201 Tunica Dr. West
Marksville LA
71351

Jospehine Hagel
Elementary Superintendent
East Carroll Schools
P.O. Box 792
Lake Providence LA
71254

Max Skidmore
Superintendent
LaFayette Parish School System
P.O. Drawer 2158
LaFayette LA
70502

Sue Magee-Tullos
Bogalusa City Schools
113 Cumberland St.
P.O. Box 310
Bogalusa LA
70429-0310

Perry P. Spears
Superintendent
East Feliciana Parish Schools
P.O. Box 397
Clinton LA
70722

J. Rogers Pope
Superintendent
Livingstone Parish Schools
P.O. Box 1130
Livingston LA
70754

Katy McCallister
Bossier Parish School Board
P.O. Box 2000
Benton LA
70429-0310

Larry J. Broussard
Superintendent
Evangeline Parish Schools
1101 TE Mamou Rd.
Ville Platte LA
70586

Martin Verhagen
Superintendent
Madison Parish Schools
P.O. Box 1620
Tallulah LA
71282

Mike Whitford
Superintendent
Natchitoches Parish Schools
P.O. Box 16
Natchitoches LA
71457

Daniel Baste
St. Bernard Parish School Board
67 E. Chalmette Circle
Charlmette LA
70043

Donald H. Pennington
Superintendent
Tensas Parish Schools
P.O. Box 318
St. Joseph LA
71366

Everett J. Williams
Superintendent
Orleans Parish Schools
4100 Touro St.
New Orleans LA
70122

Thomas S. Tocco
Superintendent
St. Charles Parish School System
P.O. Box 46
Luling LA
70070

Daniel Dartez
Superintendent
Vermilion Parish Schools
P.O. Drawer 520
Aberville LA
71446

Carroll A. Perlander
Superintendent
Plaquemines Parish Schools
P.O. Box 69
Belle Chasse LA
70037

Gerald J. Keller
Superintendent
St. John Parish School
P.O. Drawer A L
Reserve LA
70084

Earle R. Brown
Superintendent
Washington Parish Schools
P.O. Box 587
Franklinton LA
70438

Michael J. Lucia
Superintendent
Pointe Coupee Parish Schools
P.O. Drawer 579
New Roads LA
70760

Raymond E. Fontenot
Superintendent
St. Landry Parish Schools
P.O. Box 310
Opelousas LA
70571-0310

Patrick Cooper
Superintendent
West Feliciana Parish Schools
P.O. Box 1910
St. Francesville LA
70775

MASSACHUSETTS

Lanny Johnson
Superintendent
Quachita Parish School System
100 Bry St.
P.O. Box 1642
Monroe LA
71210-1642

Alta B. Brown
Superintendent
St. Tammany Parish Schools
P.O. Box 940
Covington LA
70434

Principal
John Glen Middle School
McMahan Rd.
Bedford MA
01730

E.A. Nichols
Superintendent
Rapides Parish School Board
P.O. Box 1230
Alexandria LA
71309-1230

Ted Carson
Superintendent
Tangipahoa Parish Schools
P.O. Box 457
Amite LA
70422

Principal
Blackstone Square
Community School
380 Shawmut Ave.
Boston MA
02118

Frank Guiliano, Jr.
Superintendent
Milton Public Schools
Brook Road at Central
Milton MA
02186

Diane Haarman
Project Coordinator
Nashoba Regional High School District
12 Green Road
Bolton MA
01740

Ronald L. Snyder
Superintendent
MAINE SAD 11 Gardiner
P.O. Box 250
Gardiner ME
04345

MARYLAND

Wilbur Hixon
Principal
Andover High School
Andover MA
01810

Barbara Chase
Headmistress
Bryn Mawr School
109 West Melrose
Baltimore MD
21210

Michael Cormier
Superintendent
SAD 56
Mortland Rd.
P.O. Box 467
Searsport ME
04974

Anne Reenstierna
Headmistress
Brimmer and May School
69 Middlesex Road
Chestnut Hill MA
02167

Pamela L. Shaw
Principal
Park Heights Street Academy
3901 Park Heights Avenue
Baltimore MD
21215

Albert S. Hall
Superintendent
Waterville School Dept.
21 Gilman St.
Waterville ME
04901

Sidney Smith
Principal
English High School
144 McBride Street
Jamaica Plain MA
02130

Samuel Billups
Principal
Walbrook High School
2000 Edgewood Street
Baltimore MD
21216

Dana Allen
Principal
Portland High School
284 Cumberland Avenue
Portland ME
04101

MAINE

Larry Myatt
Director
Bunker Hill Community College
New Rutherford Avenue
Boston MA
02129

William Dove
Superintendent
Islesboro School Dept.
P.O. Box 118
Islesboro ME
04848

Jean Konzal
Learning Coordinator
Maine Department of Education
State House Station #23
Augusta ME
04333

Lisa Bryant
Principal
Bartlett School
79 Wannalancit Street
Lowell MA
01854

Jay Bartner
Superintendent
Old Orchard Beach School Department
Jameson Hill Rd.
Old Orchard ME
04064

Julia Phelp
Principal
Wells Junior High School
P.O. Box 310
Wells ME
04090

Valijeane Olenn
Principal
Wells High School
P.O. Box 578
Wells ME
04090

Sally Kakitis
Associate President
41 Rust Road
Gorham ME
04388

## MICHIGAN

Lawrence Patrick
Detroit School Board President
c/o Detroit Public Schools
5057 Woodward
Detroit MI
48202

Kristi O'Brian
Project Coordinator
112 East Maple
Vicksburg MI
49097

Patricia Kloostermann
Terry Morris, Principal
Mendan Community Schools
26393 Kirby
Mendon MI
49072

## MINNESOTA

David St. Germain
Project Coordinator
Chaska Public Schools
110600 Village Road
Chaska MN
55318

## MISSOURI

Craig Larson
Principal
Parkway South High School
801 Hanna Road
Manchester MO
63021

Mary L. Burke
Headmistress
Ann Watt
Whitfield School
175 South Mason Road
St. Louis MO
63141

## MISSISSIPPI

Doris Smith
Superintendent
Winona Public Schools
214 Fair Ground St.
Winona MS
38967

## MONTANA

Peter Carparelli
Superintendent
Billings School District #2
415 N. 30th St.
Billings MT
59101

## NORTH CAROLINA

Principal
North Asheboro Middle School
900 West Bailey St.
Asheboro NC
27230

Principal
Hazelwood Elementary School
216 Virginia Ave.
Hazelwood NC
28783

Janice Sherrill
Principal
Konnoak School
3200 Renon Road
Winston-Salem NC
27105

William Peay
Principal
Parkland High School
1600 Brewer Road
Winston-Salem NC
27127

Dawn Wooten
Principal
Philo Middle School
410 Haverhill Street
Winton-Salem NC
27127

Rebecca Scott
Project Coordinator
North Asheboro Middle School
900 West Bailey Street
Asheboro NC
27203

## NORTH DAKOTA

Gordon Baumgartner
Principal
Beulah High School
205 North 5th St.
Beulah ND
58523

Betty Neigum
Project Coordinator
Dickinson Public School District
P.O. Box 1057
Dickinson ND
58601

NEBRASKA

Ben Nelson
Governor
State Capitol
Lincoln NE
68509

Theresa Sadler
Principal
Turquoise Trail Elementary
Route 2 Box 800
Santa Fe NM
87502

Stephen Dilg
Principal
Capshaw Middle School
351 W. Zia Road
Santa Fe NM
87501

Mike Peterson
Asst. Superintendent
South Sioux City Public Schools
3625 G St., Box 158
South Sioux NE
68776

Steven Dilg
Principal
Capshaw Middle School
351 Via Rd.
Santa Fe NM
81501

Ruth Johnson
Principal
Roosevelt Middle School
P.O. Box 310
Tijeras NM
87059

Dennis Gehringer
Project Coordinator
Millard Education Association
13823 "P" Street
Omaha NE
68137

Andrew Rendon
Principal
Capital High School
4851 Paseo Del Sol
Santa Fe NM
81501

Sandra Purrington
Principal
Sweeney Elementary School
501 Airport Road
Santa Fe NM
87501

NEW JERSEY

Victor Gilson
Superintendent
Dennis Schools
Academy Road
Dennisville NJ
07402

Patsy Duran
President, Board of Education
3220 Dryer St.
Las Cruces NM
88001

Barbara Gordon
Principal
Dowa Yalane Elementary School
P.O. Box Drawer D
Zuni NM
87327

Barbara Stobert
Am2K Coordinator
Montclair Public Schools
Montclair NJ
07042

Dennis Littky
Principal
Bernalillo Middle School
P.O. Box 640
Bernalillo NM
87004

Alfonso Garcia
Principal
El Dorado Elementary School
2 Avenida Torreon
Santa Fe NM
87505

NEW MEXICO

Riette Mutleston
Principal
Sweenie Elementary
501 Airport Rd.
Santa Fe NM
87501

Andrew Rendon
Principal
Capital High School
4851 Paseo Del Sol
Santa Fe NM
87501

Joan Pritchard
Principal
Santa Fe Technical High School
2201 West Zia Road
Santa Fe NM
87501

Linda Belarde
Principal
Twin Buttes High School
P.O. Box 680
Zuni NM
87327

John Cheska
Headmaster
Adelphi Academy
8515 Ridge Boulevard
Brooklyn NY
11209

Laura Frenk
Principal
John Jay High School
Katonah NY
10536

Bruce Sojka
Principal
Zuni High School
P.O. Box 550
Zuni NM
87327

Dave Lehman
Principal
Alternative Community School
111 Chestnut Street
Ithaca NY
14850

Anthony Aranella
Director
Scarsdale Alternative School
45 Wayside Lane
Scarsdale NY
10583

Jack Bradley
Principal
Zuni Middle School
P.O. Box 447
Zuni NM
87327

Maureen Grolnick
Principal
Bronxville High School
Pondfield Road
Bronxville NY
10708

Dan Drmacich
Administrator
School Without Walls
480 Broadway
Rochester NY
14607

Pedro Atencio
Learning Coordinator
Santa Fe Public Schools
Sierra Vista Annex 13
1300 Camino Sierra Vista
Santa Fe NM
87505

Brian Howard
Principal
Chatham High School
50 Woodbridge Avenue
Chatham NY
12037

Carolyn Jones
Principal
The Bronx New School
3200 Jerome Avenue
Bronx NY
10468

NEW YORK

Penny Constantine
A2K Coordinator
Trinity School
180 Pelham Rd.
New Rochelle NY
10805

Sherry King
Principal
Croton-Harmon High School
Old Post Road, South
Croton-on-Hudso NY
10520

Mary Ellen Bosch
Director
The Brooklyn New School
Nelson & Hicks Streets
Brooklyn NY
11215

Jeff Schmidt
Am2K Coordinator
Longwood Middle School
Middle Isl-Yaphark Rd.
Middle Island NY
11953

Harry McCormak
Principal
Fox Lane High School
Rte. #172, South Bedford Rd.
Bedford NY
10506

Paul Schwarz
Co-Director
Central Park East
Secondary School
1573 Madison Avenue
New York NY
10029

Lucy Matos
Director
Central Park East I
1573 Madison Avenue
New York NY
10029

Leslie Alexander
Director
River East
116th Street & FDR Drive
New York NY
10029

Heather Lewis
Regional Coordinators
Center for Collaborative Education
Central Park East Schools
1573 Madison Avenue
New York NY
10029

Kyle Haver
Director
Central Park East II
215 East 99th Street
New York NY
10029

Gwen Solomon
Principal
School of the Future
210 East 33rd Street
New York NY
10016

Richard Bennett
Project Coordinator
183 Seneca Parkway
Rochester NY
14613

OHIO

Ann F. Wiener
Director
Crossroads Schools
234 West 109th Street
New York NY
10025

Alan Dichter
Principal
Satellite Academy - Forsyth
198 Forsyth Street
New York NY
10002

Principal
Upper Arlington High School
1650 Ridgeview Rd.
Upper Arlington OH
43221

Cecilia L. Cullen
Principal
Middle College High School
31-11 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City NY
11101

Nancy Mohr
Principal
University Heights High School
University Ave. & West 181st .
New York NY
10453

Steve Scovic
A2K Parent Organizer
306 W. Whitier Ave.
Fairborn OH
45324

Blossom Gelerntter
Principal
P.S. 234 Independence School
292 Greenwich Street
New York NY
10007

Ann Cook
Co-Director
Urban Academy
351 West 18th Street
New York NY
10011

Dan Hoffman
Principal
Reynoldsburg High School
6699 East Livingston Avenue
Reynoldsburg OH
43068-3698

Ann Powers
Staff Developer
P.S. 261 The New Program
314 Pacific Street
Brooklyn NY
11201

Joan Carney
Regional Coordinator
755 West End Ave.
New York NY
10025

Michael Hicks
Principal
Woodward High School
7001 Reading Road
Cincinnati OH
45237

OREGON

Harry Hillegas
Project Coordinator
Brown Middle School
228 S. Scranton
Ravenna OH
44266

Principal
Howard Elementary School
700 Howard Ave.
Eugene OR
97404

Wes Smith
Superintendent
Newberg S.D. 29JT
1431 Deborah Rd.
Newberg OR
97132

Tom Bassett
Upper Arlington City Schools
1650 Ridgeview Rd.
Upper Arlington OH
43221

George Lanning
Superintendent
Amity School District 4Jt
P.O. Box 138
Amity OR
97101

Ian Grabenhorst
Superintendent
Sheridan S.D. 48JT
339 NW Sherman
Sheridan OR
97378

OKLAHOMA

James Barns
MAPCO Inc.
800 S. Baltimore Ave.
Tulsa OK
74119

Brian Metke
Principal
Burns High School
1100 Oregon Ave.
Burns OR
97720

Paul Plath
Superintendent
Springfield School District 19
525 Mill St.
Springfield OR
97477-4548

Jim Harlow
CoChair, AMERICA 2000
Kerr McGee Corp.
P.O. Box 25861
Oklahoma City OK
73125

Mark Hyder
Superintendent Principal
Carlton School District 11
P.O. Box 338
Carlton OR
97111

Gerry Elstun
Superintendent
Willamina School District 30JT
324 SE Adams
Williamina OR
97396

BOB VERNON
PRINCIPAL
WESTMINSTER MIDDLE SCHOOL
540 N.W. 44TH STREET
OKLAHOMA OK
73118

Steve Johnson
Superintendent
526 Ferry St.
Dayton OR
97114

Nolan Ferguson
Superintendent Principal
Yamhill School District UH-1
Yamhill-Carlton Union H.S.
275 N. Maple St.
Yamhill OR
97148

Diane Anderson
Project Coordinator
Lincoln Elementary School
900 Choctaw Drawer A
Chickasha OK
73023

Mike Brott
Superintendent
McMinnville School District 40
15000 N. Baker
McMinnville OR
97128

James Redmond
Yamhill City
Yamhill Education Service
800 E. Second St.
McMinnville OR
97128

RHODE ISLAND

Bill Bentley
Superintendent
Yamhill School District 16
310 E. Main
Yamhill OR
97148

DONALD REED
PRINCIPAL
GARDEN SPOT SR/JR HIGH SCHOOL
ROUTE 23 & TOWER ROAD
NEW PA
17557

Henry Tarlian
Superintendent
34 Warwick Lake Ave.
Warwick RI
02889

PENNSYLVANIA

HOLLY H. PERRY
PRINCIPAL
ACADEMY FOR THE MIDDLE YEARS
WASHINGTON LANE & MUSGRAVE
PHILADELPHIA PA
19144

JOHN SYPHARD
PRINCIPAL
McCASKEY HIGH SCHOOL
RESERVOIR STREET, BOX 15
LANCASTER PA
17603

CHARLES VAN GORDEN
PRINCIPAL
CENTRAL FALLS JR/SR HIGH
24 SUMMER STREET
CENTRAL RI
02863

CHARLES COMO
HEADMASTER
THE CREFELD SCHOOL
8836 CREFELD STREET
PHILADELPHIA PA
19118

ROBERT ANDERSON
PRINCIPAL
NEW HOPE - SOLEBURY
180 WEST BRIDGE STREET
NEW HOPE PA
18938

DARCEY HALL
HEADMISTRESS
GORDON SCHOOL
MAXFIELD AVENUE
EAST RI
02914

THOMAS STAPLEFORD
PRINCIPAL
BELLFONTE HIGH SCHOOL
301 NORTH ALLEGHENY STREET
BELLEFONTE PA
16823

Neil Raymond Smith
Principal
Tyrone Area Jr/Sr High School
Clay Avenue Extension
Tyrone PA
16686

PAUL GOUNARIS
PRINCIPAL
HOPE HIGH SCHOOL
324 HOPE STREET
PROVIDENCE RI
02906

DAVID SPAHR
PRINCIPAL
CENTRAL BUCKS HIGH SCHOOL
HOLICONG & ANDERSON ROADS
BUCKINGHAM PA
18912

JEAN di SABATINO
LEARNING COORDINATOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
333 MARKET ST.
HARRISBURG PA
17126-0333

MANUEL J. BARBOZA
PRINCIPAL
MARY V. QUIRK SCHOOL
790 MAIN STREET
WARREN RI
02885

DON HESSLER
PRINCIPAL
CENTRAL BUCKS HIGH SCHOOL
WEST COURT & LAFAYETTE STREETS
DOYLESTOWN PA
18901

Carol Polkinghorn
Project Coordinator
11 Park Street
Greensburg PA
15601

DAVID HAYES
PRINCIPAL
NARRAGANSETT ELEMENTARY
55 MUMFORD ROAD
NARRAGANSET RI
02882

ROBERT BATES
PRINCIPAL
NARRAGANSETT PIER SCHOOL
235 SOUTH PIER ROAD
NARRAGANSET RI
02882

John Thompson
Project Coordinator
Westerly Public Schools
28 Chestnut Street
Westerly RI
02891

David Wetzel
Superintendent
Elizabethton City School System
804 So. Watauga Ave.
Elizabethton TN
37743

SOUTH CAROLINA

ARNOLD FRANK
PRINCIPAL
NARRAGANSETT SENIOR HIGH
245 SOUTH PIER ROAD
NARRAGANSET RI
02882

J. ROBERT SHIRLEY
PRINCIPAL
HEATHWOOD HALL
3000 SOUTH BELTLINE BOULEVARD
COLUMBIA SC
29201

Wade McCamey
Superintendent
Greene County School System
910 W. Summer St.
Greeneville TN
37743

SOUTH DAKOTA

DENISE JENKINS
PRINCIPAL
SCHOOL ONE
75 JOHN STREET
PROVIDENCE RI
02906

Orville Creighton
Superintendent
Box 659
Hill City SD
57745

Jerry Ward
Superintendent
Greeneville City Schools
P.O. Box 1420
Greeneville TN
37744

KATHY SIOK
PRINCIPAL
ST. XAVIER ACADEMY
225 MACARTHUR BLVD.
COVENTRY RI
02816

George Levin
Superintendent
101 Pine St.
Agar SD
57520

Ernest Walker
Superintendent
Hamblen County School System
210 E. Morris Blvd.
Morristown TN
37813

TENNESSEE

PETER BLACKWELL
PRINCIPAL
RI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF
CORLISS PARK
PROVIDENCE RI
02908

James A. Street
Superintendent
Bristol City Schools
615 Edgemont Ave.
Bristol TN
37620

Bill Justice
Superintendent
Hawkins County School System
210 No. Depot St.
Rogersville TN
37857

KEN FISH
LEARNING COORDINATOR
STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION
22 HAYES ST.
PROVIDENCE RI
02908

Larry Blazer
Superintendent
Cocke County Schools
605 College St.
Newport TN
39821

Charles Tollett
Superintendent
Kingsport City Schools
1701 E. Center St.
Kingsport TN
37664

TEXAS

Mike Simmons
Superintendent
Johnson City Schools
P.O. Box 1517
Johnson City TN
37683

Dallas Hardin
Executive Director
Upper E. Tennessee Cooperative
P.O. Box 23110A ETSU
Johnson City TN
37614

Elizabeth Flores
Senior Vice President
P.O. Box 59
Laredo TX
78042-0059

John Payne
Superintendent
Johnson County School System
211 No. Church St.
Mountain City TN
37683

Grant Rowland
Superintendent
Washington County School System
405 W. College St.
Junesborough TN
37659

Richard G. Rivera
Executive Assistant
Office of the Mayor
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio TX
78283-3966

James Gaddis
Superintendent
Newport City Schools
202 College Street
Newport TN
37821

Gerald Bailey
Principal
Hixson High School
5705 Middle Valley Pike
Chattanooga TN
37343

Jose Manzano
Superintendent
P.O. Box 158
Zapata TX
78076

Gary Peevely
Superintendent
Rogersville City Schools
116 Broadway
Rogersville TN
37617

Rev. William S. Wade
Headmaster
St. Andrew's – Sewanee
St. Andrew's TN
37372

NITA WHITESIDE
PRINCIPAL
PASCHAL HIGH SCHOOL
3001 FOREST PARK BOULEVARD
FORT WORTH TX
76110

Ron Wilcox
Superintendent
Sullivan County School System
P.O. Box 306
Blountville TN
37617

Lennell Terrell
Project Coordinator
Memphis Education Association
126 South Flicker Street
Memphis TN
38104

JIM JUDSON
DIRECTOR
THE JUDSON
MONTESSORI SCHOOL
705 TRAFALGAR
SAN ANTONIO TX
78216

Ron Wilcox
Superintendent
Unicoi County School System
600 No. Elm Ave.
Erwin TN
37650

Garland Cureton
Hamblen County Board of Education
210 E. Morris Blvd.
Morristown TN
37813

SHIRLEY JOHNSON
PRINCIPAL
WESTBURY HIGH SCHOOL
5575 GASMER ROAD
HOUSTON TX
77035

Marilyn Butcher
Principal
Travis Heights Elementary
2010 Alameda
Austin TX
78704

Vicki Baldwin
Principal
Fulmore Middle School
201 East Mary Street
Austin TX
78704

Elena Vela
Principal
Travis High School
1211 East Oltorf
Austin TX
78704

UTAH

Principal
M. Lynn Bennion School
429 South 800 East
Salt Lake City UT
84102

Principal
Westridge Elementary School
1720 West 1460 North
Provo UT
84604

Steven Peterson
Superintendent
189 West Tabernacle St.
Saint George UT
84770

Ron Stephens
Superintendent
Murray School District
147 E. 5065 South
Murray UT
84107

Brent Rock
Superintendent
195 E. 5th North St.
Richfield UT
84701

John Bone
Westridge Elementary School
1720 West 1460 North
Provo UT
84604

VERMONT

SVEN HUSEBY
INTERIM DIRECTOR
THE PUTNEY SCHOOL
ELM LEA FARM
PUTNEY VT
05346

WASHINGTON

ROBERT STRODE
PRINCIPAL
FINN HILL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
8040 NE 132ND STREET
KIRKLAND WA
98034

CLARICE B. SCHORZMAN
PRINCIPAL
JEMTEGAARD MIDDLE SCHOOL
35300 EAST EVERGREEN
WASHOUGAL WA
98671

PRINCIPAL
THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL
301 151ST PLACE NORTHEAST
BELLEVUE WA
98007

Vicki Foreman
Principal
Kimball Elementary School
3200 – 23rd Avenue, South
Seattle WA
98144

Greg Schell
Director
School Instructional Services
Bellevue Public Schools
P.O. Box 90010
Bellevue WA
98009-9010

WISCONSIN

DOUGLAS MOLZAHN
PRINCIPAL
LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL
1433 SOUTH 8TH STREET
MANITOWOC WI
54220

CHARLES KENT
PRINCIPAL
WALDEN III
1012 CENTER STREET
RACINE WI
53403

WEST VIRGINIA

Principal
Capital High School
200 Elizabeth St.
Charleston WV
25311

# SECTION FOUR

## National List of Schools Engaged in Collaborative Restructuring Between Special & General Education

## *Section Four – National List of Schools Engaged in Collaborative Restructuring Between Special and General Education*

### CALIFORNIA

Lois Jones
Principal
Oceana High School
401 Paloma Avenue
Pacifica CA
91107

Tim Scully
Assistant Principal
North High School
3620 W. 182nd St.
Torrance CA
90504

Bill Herrera
San Ramon Valley U.S.D.
9870 Broadmoor Dr.
San Ramon CA
94583

John DiPaola
Fremont Unified School District
41800 Blacow Rd.
Fremont CA
94538

### COLORADO

J. Timothy Waters
Superintendent
Weld//City S.D. 6
811 15th St.
Greeley CO
80631

Peggy Reynolds
Weld County
School District RE-8
301 Reynolds
Ft. Lupton CO
80621

### FLORIDA

Charlotte Brower
Coral Springs Middle School
10300 West Wiles Rd.
Coral Springs FL
33076

### GEORGIA

Robert Cresswell
Principal
Salem High School
3551 Underwood Road
Conyers GA
30208

Wayne Stone
Brooks Elementary
119 Price Rd.
Brooks GA
30205

Jerry Locke
A.L. Burruss Elementary
325 Manning Rd.
Marietta GA
30064

Deloris Bryant-Booker
Love T. Nolan Elementary
2725 Creel Rd.
College Park GA
30349

### IOWA

Damon Lamb
Miller Middle School
210 S. 12th Ave.
Area Education Agency 6
Marshalltown IA
50158

### LOUISIANA

Phillis Crawford
Principal
Audobon Elementary
10730 Goodwood Blvd.
Baton Rouge LA
70815

### MICHIGAN

Patricia Kloostermann
Terry Morris, Principal
Mendan Community Schools
26393 Kirby
Mendon MI
49072

### MISSOURI

Mary L. Burke
Headmistress
Ann Watt
Whitfield School
175 South Mason Road
St. Louis MO
63141

### NEW YORK

Cecilia L. Cullen
Principal
Middle College High School
31-11 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City NY
11101

### OHIO

Harry Hillegas
Project Coordinator
Brown Middle School
228 S. Scranton
Ravenna OH
44266

Tom Bassett
Upper Arlington City Schools
1650 Ridgeview Rd.
Upper Arlington OH
43221

PENNSYLVANIA

HOLLY H. PERRY
PRINCIPAL
ACADEMY FOR THE MIDDLE YEARS
WASHINGTON LANE & MUSGRAVE
PHILADELPHIA PA
19144

TENNESSEE

Garland Cureton
Hamblen County Board of Education
210 E. Morris Blvd.
Morristown TN
37813

UTAH

John Bone
Westridge Elementary School
1720 West 1460 North
Provo UT
84604

***It is important to note that CRI has not had the opportunity to visit these school sites and/or validate their restructuring efforts. We present this list based on the sites' indicating that they wished to be included on our list.***